ST. ALBERT'S COLLEGE LIBRARY

IRENAEUS OF LUGDUNUM

By the same Author

The Atonement and Modern Thought (Wells, Gardner) 7/6

A Fresh Study of the Fourth Gospel (S.P.C.K.) . 2/6

Clement of Alexandria (S.P.C.K.) 3/-

St Augustine's "City of God." A Translation with Notes. New and revised edition (S.P.C.K.) . 1/6

The Present Controversy on Prayer (S.P.C.K.) . 2/-

Christ and His Critics (Robert Scott) . . . 3/-

Suggestions for Bible Study (Elliot Stock) . . 2/-

The Present and the Future Christ (S.P.C.K.) . 2/6

The Mystery of the Cross (Skeffington) . . . 3/6

Midland Septs and the Pale (Sealy, Bryers) . . 3/6

Types of Celtic Life and Art (Sealy, Bryers) . . 3/6

Hebrew Types (Francis Griffiths) 6/-

IRENAEUS OF LUGDUNUM

A STUDY OF HIS TEACHING

by

F. R. MONTGOMERY HITCHCOCK, M.A. D.D.
Formerly University Student, Fellowship Prizeman and
Donnellan Lecturer of Trinity College, Dublin

WITH A FOREWORD

by

H. B. SWETE, D.D.
Regius Professor of Divinity, Cambridge

Cambridge :
at the University Press
1914

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS
C. F. CLAY, MANAGER
London: FETTER LANE, E.C.
Edinburgh: 100, PRINCES STREET

Berlin: A. ASHER AND CO.
Leipzig: F. A. BROCKHAUS
New York: G. P. PUTNAM'S SONS
Bombay and Calcutta: MACMILLAN AND CO., LTD.
Toronto: J. M. DENT AND SONS, LTD.
Tokyo: THE MARUZEN-KABUSHIKI-KAISHA

All rights reserved

AUTHOR'S PREFACE

THE author of this book takes the opportunity of expressing his warmest thanks and many obligations to Professor Swete and to the staff of the Cambridge University Press for their invaluable assistance and many helpful suggestions during its production. He would also acknowledge his indebtedness to Professor Sanday of Oxford, who wrote him a kind letter many years ago encouraging him to proceed with his studies in Irenaeus. He trusts that the results of these studies will be acceptable to the great scholars who have shown a friendly interest in the work, and whose verdict he awaits with no little apprehension.

Pagina judicium docti subitura movetur.

F. R. M. H.

KINNITTY,
April 8, 1914.

ST. ALBERT'S COLLEGE LIBRARY

FOREWORD

NO early Christian writer has deserved better of the whole Church than Irenaeus. His refutation of Gnosticism is perhaps the least of his claims upon the attention of the student. Gnosticism would doubtless have met its fate if Irenaeus had never written, and for the modern reader its grotesque speculations have little interest. But the great work of Irenaeus offers us far more than the polemic of a by-gone age. It is a first effort to grapple on a large scale with the problems of the rising faith, and to construct the outlines of a Christian theology. It is a storehouse of materials for the early history of the canon, the creed, and the episcopate. It contains not a few passages of singular beauty and far-reaching insight, which are hardly surpassed in any other Christian writing, ancient or modern.

Dr Montgomery Hitchcock's book is an attempt to introduce the student to the teaching of Irenaeus. Any real endeavour to recall our age to the treasures hidden in the great writers of the ancient Church may be heartily welcomed, and it is to be hoped that Dr Hitchcock's work may succeed in leading some who have hitherto overlooked the claims of Irenaeus to study for themselves that great forerunner of the best theology of the later Church.

H. B. SWETE.

CAMBRIDGE,
EASTER, 1914.

CONTENTS

CHAPS.		PAGES
I.	The Life of Irenaeus	1
II.	The Teachers of Irenaeus	19
III.	The Treatise against the Heresies	35
IV.	The Education of Man	52
V.	The Rule of Faith	65
VI.	The Omnipotent Father	78
VII.	Man's Knowledge of God	95
VIII.	The Doctrine of the Trinity	106
IX.	The Incarnate Word	127
X.	The Incarnation and the Atonement	158
XI.	Biblical Views, Interpretation of Scripture, etc.	183
XII.	The Canon of the New Testament	211
XIII.	Notes of the Church	242
XIV.	The Ministry, Continuity and Orders	251
XV.	The Sacraments of the Church	264
XVI.	Psychology, Salvation, Future Hope	283
XVII.	The Apostolic Preaching	312
XVIII.	Gnosticism Ancient and Modern	321
XIX.	Creed and Conclusion	340
	Excursus. Latin Translation	347
	Bibliography	358
	Index	359

ADDENDA ET CORRIGENDA

p. 2, l. 1, lit. instructed in the faith, *μαθητευθείς*.

l. 5, *ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ ἡμῶν ἡλικίᾳ*.

l. 13, Bury (*Student's Roman Empire* p. 579) says "A.D. 155 is only a guess of Waddington, which has been too hastily accepted." He suggests date of martyrdom 166 A.D., "almost certainly under Marcus."

l. 17, *παῖς ὢν ἔτι* (Letter to Florinus).

l. 20, about A.D. 120 (Lightfoot).

p. 6, l. 7, comma after "proceeds."

note 2, 1 *for* 6.

p. 8, l. 13, read "in which case" *for* "so that."

p. 10, l. 6. *Historia Francorum*, I. 29.

l. 14, see Duchesne's *Fastes Episcopaux*.

p. 12, l. 2, comma after "custom."

l. 18, v.l. "forty hours" (Bingham, removing stop after *τεσσαράκοντα*). Harvey, Stieren and Massuet read as in text.

note 1, 357 *for* 356.

p. 16, l. 22, comma after "Basil."

p. 23, l. 19, comma after "suffering."

p. 25, note 4, cf. Lightfoot's *Essays on Supernatural Religion* v. Insert "probably" after "This is."

p. 26, l. 5, cf. Charles' *Apocalypse of Baruch*, p. 54.

p. 30, l. 27, "can we be" *for* "are we."

p. 32, l. 1, lit. making a prelude of, or preparation for, *προοιμιαζομένους τὴν ἀφθαρσίαν*, cf. Eusebius *H.E.* v. 1. 4, of the devil, *προοιμιαζόμενος ἤδη τὴν ἀδεῶς μέλλουσαν ἔσεσθαι παρουσίαν αὐτοῦ*.

l. 9, *ἐνυβρίζει*, lit. mocks at.

p. 36, 2, *Dogmengeschichte* I. 188.

p. 38, l. 9, lit. "truer than the truth itself."

CHAPTER I

THE LIFE OF IRENAEUS

MATERIALS for a Life of Irenaeus are so meagre that the bare outline of his career, which is given in detached portions, must be filled in by the imagination. The same reserve in his writings conceals a personality of much charm and many gifts. The little he says of himself makes one desire to know more of one who was a scholar and a saint. It is held that he was a Greek from the mode of his thought and the form of his name. It is generally inferred that he was a native of Smyrna from the fact that he was a disciple of Polycarp, to whom he refers in expressions of love and veneration.

His early associations with that Apostolic man alone would make him an interesting character. In a fragment of his work preserved by Eusebius[1] we have an invaluable account of this intimacy. Writing to Florinus he says that he could even describe the very place in which Polycarp was wont to sit and converse, his goings-out and comings-in, the mode of his life, his personal appearance, the discourses he delivered to the people, the manner in which he would speak of his intercourse with John and the others who had seen the Lord. From a passage in the treatise *Against the Heresies*[2] where he

[1] *H. E.* v. 20. [2] III. 3. 4.

states, "And Polycarp was not only educated by the apostles and frequently in the society of many who had seen the Lord, but he was also appointed by the apostles to be the bishop of the Church in Smyrna, wherefore I said 'in my early youth,' for he lived to a great age," we may approximately infer the relative ages of the master and pupil. The date of Polycarp's martyrdom is, in some measure, an indication of the date of the birth of Irenaeus, for it was not long after his visit to Rome, on which he was probably accompanied by Irenaeus, that the old man suffered. The death of Polycarp, described in the letter of the Smyrnaeans, is assigned by Lightfoot to A.D. 155. It is probable that he perished between A.D. 150 and 156, and being eighty and six years old at the time, was born before A.D. 70.

Irenaeus only knew him in the latter years of his life when he himself was "in his first age," and "a mere boy." The date of the birth of Irenaeus is accordingly assigned by Harvey to A.D. 130, by Lipsius to A.D. 137, but by Zahn to A.D. 115. Ropes' date A.D. 126 corresponds more nearly with the statement of Irenaeus that John beheld his vision "almost in our own generation, towards the end of the reign of Domitian[1]," who perished A.D. 96, if one allows thirty years to a generation. It is also to be noticed that Irenaeus extends "the first age of youth" to forty years[2]. The Moscow postscript of the letter of the Smyrnaeans, accepted as genuine by Bishop Lightfoot, states that a certain Gaius copied this letter from the writings of Irenaeus a former pupil of the holy Polycarp, and that this Irenaeus was living in Rome at the time of that saint's martyrdom and had many pupils, and that on the very day when Polycarp was martyred

[1] *Adv. Haer.* v. 30. 3. [2] II. 22. 5.

in Smyrna, Irenaeus heard a voice as of a trumpet saying, "Polycarp has borne testimony."

There is much probability that Irenaeus spent some years of his early manhood in Rome, where first he encountered the Gnostics, studied the works of Justin, to which he shows much indebtedness, laid the foundation of his great work against the heresies, and made that acquaintance with the history of the Roman Church and creed which is conspicuous in his writings[1]. It is not unlikely that he had an opportunity of witnessing that impressive scene in the church between Polycarp and Anicetus, Bishop of Rome, which he describes so vividly in his letter to Victor.

What, then, brought Irenaeus to Lugdunum, the modern Lyons, of which he became bishop? The accounts are conflicting. Gregory of Tours, not the most reliable authority, declares that he was sent by Polycarp to Lugdunum. Mr F. E. Warren in *The Liturgy and Ritual of the Celtic Church* hazards the statement that "Pothinus, the first Bishop of Lyons, had come directly from that country (Asia Minor) bringing with him Irenaeus, the disciple of Polycarp, the disciple of John." It is not unlikely, however, that Irenaeus remained in Rome until A.D. 164 when a local persecution, under Marcus Aurelius, silenced for ever the voices of several Christian teachers, and among them that of the illustrious Justin Martyr. The young student was, therefore, compelled to take refuge in the neighbouring Church of Gaul, which had an early and close connection with the Churches of the East.

But whether Gallican Christianity came originally from an eastern or a western source is a debated question.

[1] III. 3. 3.

The ready communication of the towns in Southern Gaul (especially Marseilles) with Italy and the Mediterranean by sea inclines one to hold the Eastern origin. But L'Abbé L. Duchesne in *Fastes Épiscopaux de l'ancienne Gaule* maintains that the connection of the Christians of the Rhone valley with the East was slight, and that the idea of such a connection was largely based upon the legends of subsequent ages. But he allows that "among all the ships that entered the port of Massilia in the earliest age of Christianity some would have had evangelists on board." The greater number of these would, however, have made their way up the interior towards Lyons and Vienne, where we find the earliest settlements of the Church in Gaul. There are several things that point to an old-standing friendship between the Churches of Asia and Phrygia and these Christian settlements in Gaul. The Christians in Vienne and Lyons addressed a circular "to the Brethren throughout Asia and Phrygia[1]." Among the martyrs of Lyons we find the names of Attalus of Pergamos and Alexander, a physician, from Phrygia. Some little time afterwards the martyrs of Lyons sent a letter containing their views on the Montanist heresy and defending their Asiatic brethren, to Eleutherus bishop of Rome by the hands of Irenaeus, and another epistle on the same subject to the Asiatics themselves. It is probable, therefore, that if the Church in Lyons was not the daughter of the Church in Smyrna "the Christianity of Gaul," as Lightfoot said, "was in some sense the daughter of the Christianity of Asia Minor."

To Lyons, accordingly, Irenaeus came, bringing testimonials and letters to the venerable Pothinus, bishop

[1] Eusebius *H. E.* v. 1.

of that city. There is reason to believe that he was admitted to the priesthood by that bishop. Jerome describes him as "the Presbyter of the Bishop Pothinus who ruled the Church of Lugdunum in Gaul," and Eusebius calls him "the Presbyter of *the Church of Lugdunum*." In the office of presbyter Irenaeus distinguished himself by his zeal, tact and scholarship, and rose so high in the estimation of bishop and people that he was regarded as the most suitable man to succeed the aged Pothinus. But in the year A.D. 177 a storm of persecution broke over the south of Gaul, and the Christians of Vienne and Lyons suffered. The narrative of their trials is recorded in a letter they sent to the brethren in Asia and Phrygia preserved in the fifth book of Eusebius' history. Thrown into prison the leading Christians of these communities awaited the advent of the Roman governor and death. Among them was Pothinus, a veteran of ninety years, Sanctus deacon of Vienne, Attalus of Pergamos, Alexander of Phrygia and Blandina. Their letters intervening in the dispute between Eleutherus and the Montanists, no doubt in the interests of peace and the Church, have already been referred to.

Of these letters Irenaeus, who was, fortunately for the Church, passed over by the Roman government, was made the bearer. Whatever may have been the purport of this communication we can hardly believe that Irenaeus would support views which were contrary to the ideas of Church life and doctrine that are to be found in his treatise. Of course he may have thought differently upon this subject in his earlier days. He was a Chiliast. But it is more probable that it was from his early connections with Asia Minor and from Papias, Justin

and Barnabas that he imbibed his ideas of the millennium, which seem to have been diffused from a single source, than from the Montanists. He also held that the gift of miracles and the prophetic charisma were still in the Church[1]. He describes "the spiritual man," adopting the Montanist distinction of "Spiritales" and "Psychici[2]." But he proceeds "the spiritual man will judge those who create schisms being without the love of God, and who do not consider the unity of the Church, but on the slightest pretext will rend and divide, and, as far as they can, destroy the great and glorious body of Christ[3]." As the Montanists were the active opponents of Church government and the principal aspirants to prophetical gifts the reference is evidently to them. Irenaeus' position seems to have been "central" between the Montanists and their opponents, holding some of the views of those people while rejecting others, and maintaining the compatibility of certain views on subjects which were matters of pious opinion with sound churchmanship.

The presbyter carries his letter, whatever its contents may have been, safely to Rome and is received by Eleutherus the bishop. To him he hands the following introduction from the martyrs of Gaul. "Father Eleutherus, we wish you joy and continued prosperity in the Lord. We send our brother and colleague with these letters to you, and we commend him to your favour as a zealous adherent of the covenant of Christ. If position conferred goodness we would emphatically recommend him, who is what his name implies, a man of peace, as a presbyter of the Church." This greeting from the

[1] II. 32. 4, III. 2. 9. [2] IV. 33. 6. [3] IV. 33. 7.

representatives of one national Church to another is an illustration of Tertullian's resonant phrase, "*contesseratio hospitalitatis*[1]," the bond and token of friendship between the Churches.

We have no facts on which to construct a picture of that interview, but we may draw certain inferences. It can hardly be doubted that Eleutherus, who had been a deacon of Anicetus, gladly welcomed the presbyter of Pothinus and the pupil of Polycarp. It is probable too that he was impressed by the personality of the envoy whose previous connection with the East and Rome marked him out as a man with a history, and whose present position in the Church made him a man with a future. His previous studies under Justin must have brought him into touch with many of the leading Roman clergy. And his mission to the bishop having been accomplished, he would have been duly escorted by some of these, his own pupil, Hippolytus afterwards Bishop of Portus, among them, on the way to Ostia and home. Arriving in the Christian quarter of the city of Lugdunum he learnt the harrowing details of the executions that had taken place during his absence, rumours of which may have reached him when abroad. The gruesome details of this baptism of blood in which Pothinus, Maturus, Sanctus, Attalus, Alexander and Blandina were baptized are related in the letter of the Gallican Churches inserted by Eusebius in the fifth book of his history, and the persecution is assigned by him to the "seventeenth year of the reign of Antoninus Verus." This is intended for L. Aurelius Verus, who was emperor with Marcus Aurelius Antoninus. The seventeenth year

[1] *De Praescr.* 20.

of M. Aurelius and Lucius Verus gives the date A.D. 177, an important landmark in the life of Irenaeus[1].

After or during the persecution the Christians who survived met and elected Irenaeus to the vacant post. The presbyter of Pothinus thus became "bishop of the paroikiai in Gaul[2]" and "leader of the brethren in that country[3]." His consecration, however, presents a difficulty. There may have been a bishop of Vienne, the neighbouring city, as there was a deacon. If so, he might have performed the ceremony. But Bishop Adon's list of Bishops (IXth century), which begins with Crescens, assigns the fourth place to Verus who attended the Council of Arles (A.D. 314), so that there could hardly have been a bishop in Vienne one hundred and thirty years before. Failing a bishop of Vienne he may have returned to Rome to be consecrated by Eleutherus, out of pure necessity not out of any consideration for the *potior principalitas* of Rome, or he may have been consecrated by some of the eastern bishops.

Irenaeus cannot have been a young man at this time, and his work in Lugdunum, to say nothing of his acquaintance with the philosophies and heresies of his time, had fitted him, above all his contemporaries, for the episcopal office. In addition to his many qualifications he had also before his mind the example and counsel of the great Polycarp. Indeed, the brief record of his old master's passion, enshrined in the circular letter of the Church of Smyrna read in the Churches of Gaul in the days of Gregory of Tours on the nativity of the saint, is said to have been copied out and studied

[1] Dr Abbott (*Expositor*) suggests that this persecution took place in the reign of Antoninus Pius, and should be dated A.D. 155.

[2] Eus. *H. E.* v. 23. [3] *ibid.* v. 24.

by Irenaeus that he might have it imprinted on his heart. It is a matter of regret that Irenaeus did not give us a complete list and collection of the many letters which Polycarp wrote to the neighbouring Churches, a work which Polycarp himself performed for Ignatius. There is, however, an invaluable reference in the treatise[1] to Polycarp's letter to the Philippians. "There is also," he said, "an excellent letter from Polycarp to the Church in Philippi, from which any one who wishes, and who cares for his salvation, may learn the nature of Polycarp's faith and exposition of the truth." The difficulties the new bishop had to face are not to be minimized. On the one hand, he complains of the teaching and influence of the followers of one Marcus in his own district of the Rhone where they had led away many women. "Some of these," he says, "made open confession of their sins, others ashamed to do this had abandoned the faith, while some were still hesitating, being as the proverb says, 'neither within nor without.'" And on the other hand the storm cloud of persecution still hung heavily over the little Christian camp in Gaul. But in spite of dangers without and fears within the new bishop was enabled by the grace of God both to disregard the intimidations and to disarm the suspicions of the Roman government in his private and public life, and in his treatise against the heretics to disprove the subtle refinements and plausible arguments of the Gnostics.

At length by his consummate ability and stirring addresses he succeeded in reestablishing the Church in the country. For his labours were not confined to the city of Lyons. Eusebius[2] says that he succeeded

[1] III. 3. 4. [2] *H. E.* v. 5.

Pothinus in the charge[1] of the district[2] around that city. Theodoret describes him as "the light of the Western Gauls," "the apostolic man who gave light to the west," and "the admirable Irenaeus who brought learning, culture, and religion to the tribes of Gaul." And Gregory of Tours declares that "in a very short time he brought the city back to Christianity." This he did mostly by preaching, which was the special prerogative of the bishop, who generally sat when speaking from the "magisterii locus[3]." He is chiefly connected in legend with Besançon and Valence. To the former place he is said to have sent a priest Ferréol and a deacon Ferjeux, and to the latter Felix a priest and Achilles and Fortunatus deacons.

Irenaeus sketches an outline of the teaching which the apostles gave the Gentiles and which he himself most probably followed in his sermons and catechetical addresses to the tribes of his districts. "In dealing with such," he says[4], "no appeal can be made to the Old Testament or its fulfilment in Christ, but one has to teach a doctrine altogether new to his hearers, namely that the gods of the Gentiles are not gods but the images of demons, that there is one God who is above every principality and power and every name which is named, that His Word, invisible by nature, had become visible and palpable among men, and descended to death, even the death of the Cross, and that they who believe in Him shall be incorruptible and inheritors of the kingdom of heaven. Such truths are proclaimed to the

[1] ἐπισκοπήν.

[2] παροικία. In Eusebius *H. E.* v. 23, the plural is used. The word is employed in the letter of the Dublin diocese of Dublin clergy to Randolph of Canterbury (Ussher IV. 530).

[3] *Adv. Haer.* III. 3. 1.

[4] IV. 24. 2.

Gentiles by word of mouth without appeal to the Scriptures. They who work among the Gentiles have, therefore, the more arduous task, but the faith of the Gentiles is all the nobler, seeing that they follow the word of God without having received previous instruction in the scriptures." This was probably his own experience. During his residence among the wild tribes of the Keltae, of whom he proved himself a true father in God, he had almost forgotten the use of Latin and Greek, having grown accustomed to the native dialects.

His relations to the outside world as a bishop of the Church were equally cordial and influential and serve to illustrate Cyprian's principle with regard to the solidary responsibility of the episcopal order[1]. On several occasions he acted as peacemaker and succeeded in preventing discord among the Churches and dissension among the brethren, notably in connection with the Paschal controversy. Victor Bishop of Rome desired to suppress the Quartodeciman use and to establish one universal use in the whole Church. He was opposed by Polycrates of Ephesus who appealed to the precedent of SS. Philip and John and addressed an independent letter to the Bishop of Rome (A.D. 196). Provoked by this opposition the latter attempted "to cast off from the general communion as heterodox the ecclesiastical districts of all Asia *in globo*, together with the neighbouring Churches that did not follow the Roman mode of observing Easter, and proclaimed such as excommunicated[2]." Many bishops strove to mediate and of these Irenaeus was chief. Having been a Quartodeciman in

[1] "Episcopatus unus est, cujus a singulis in solidum pars tenetur." *De Unitate* 5.

[2] Eusebius *H. E.* v. 24.

his youth when he lived in Asia with Polycarp who observed that custom and having become an adherent of the Roman use after leaving the East, he was well qualified to act as arbitrator in this matter, and so was a peacemaker both by name and nature.

Of his letter to Victor a fragment only is preserved, but if we may judge from its tenor it was an effective eirenicon. He described the meeting of Polycarp and Anicetus in Rome, their tenacity in maintaining their own customs, and their wisdom in refusing to make such a ground for quarrel, Anicetus even requesting Polycarp to celebrate in his presence. "Thus they parted," he says, "keeping the peace in the interests of those who observed this custom and of those who did not observe it." Irenaeus also mentions the variety of use in connection with the fast. "Some think it right to fast one; others two days; others again more, and some continue to fast for forty days including the hours of night in their reckoning." The principle Irenaeus laid down, i.e. that "this very difference in the observation of the fast confirms our concord in the faith," was quoted with approbation by the late Bishop Wordsworth[1].

Eusebius says that he corresponded with most of the "rulers of Churches" who differed on this subject, and it would appear that he also wrote a letter to Blastus, the man who began the controversy with Victor, "on schism." These efforts for peace were crowned with success as we learn from Anatolius.

Eusebius informs us that Irenaeus was a constant letter writer. He wrote an epistle to Florinus "on the Monarchy of God"; and another "on the Ogdoad" to the same person after he had lapsed into Valentinian

[1] *Ministry of Grace*, p. 356.

Gnosticism. Eusebius mentions a brief but important work "on science" against the Greeks, another "dedicated to a brother named Marcianus and containing an explanation of the apostolic preaching" which has been recently found in an Armenian translation. He also speaks of a book of miscellaneous dissertations in which Irenaeus makes mention of the Epistle to the Hebrews and the Wisdom of Solomon. Eusebius says he had personal acquaintance with these works. In his catalogue of Church writers Jerome gives high praise to the commentary on the Ogdoad, quoting the concluding words. Maximus of Turin (A.D. 422) quotes the following as from the letter to Victor: "as long as a man can do good to his neighbour and does it not, so long shall he be considered a stranger to the love of God." And the brief but pregnant saying, "It is the sole business of the Christian to study how to die," survives with many others from the *Miscellaneous Dissertations*. There are many other fragments attributed to him. Some of these, "the Pfaff fragments," will be considered in another place.

So zealous a champion of Bible truth and Church doctrine did he prove himself to be that we are not surprised that with all his engagements he made time to compile his exhaustive and elaborate treatise against the heresies. Like many another labourer, much of his projected work was undone when the pen fell from his hand. He was not spared to fulfil his intention of writing a special treatise against Marcion "in order to convict him out of his own writings, and to confute him by those very discourses of the Lord and His disciples which he himself admitted[1]."

[1] I. 27. 4.

We are, however, thankful that his great work against the heresies has been handed down, fairly well preserved, in the Latin version, by the labours of students whose names have long since been forgotten, but whose merit it was to discern the vast importance of this monumental work and the unique position its author occupied in the early Church. Fragments of the original Greek are collected from the writings of Hippolytus, the pupil of Irenaeus, who carried on his campaign against heresy, and from those of Epiphanius who quotes the preface and most of the first book against the heresies. A large number of Syriac fragments are in the Nitrian collection of the British Museum. Mr Harvey thought these favoured the notion of a Syriac version of the treatise. But in spite of the value of the treatise there came a day when there was not a copy to be found in Lyons. For Aetherius, bishop of that city, wrote to Gregory the Great asking for an account of the doings and writings of the blessed Irenaeus, and he replied that he had made a long and diligent search for such a record, but without success, while the preface of the Arundel MS. styles our author "perrarus" or very rare.

The treatise which was undertaken at the request of a friend seems to have extended over a number of years. Suffice it to say here that it abounds in beautiful passages and exquisite thoughts on the Incarnation and Atonement, and contains interesting and valuable summaries of the apostolic creed and exhaustive accounts of the Gnostic heresies. "The Word of God," he writes, "became what we are to make us what He is." "He brought down God to man by the descent of the Spirit and raised humanity to God by His incarnation." "It was right that the Mediator between God and man

should restore harmony between God and man by His affinity with both." These passages may serve as an index of the spiritual character of the work. The treatise also throws an important light upon early speculation, which was carried on beneath the cloak of Christianity and in the name of Gnosticism. This scheme for the solution of the problems of existence, viz. the relations of good and evil, God and the world, spirit and matter, revelation and redemption, creation and salvation, the finite and the absolute, the origin and destiny of things, pressed into its service texts of scripture, ecclesiastical ritual, Greek philosophy, Jewish cabala, oriental theosophy, Egyptian mythology, and the Pythagorean system of numbers. The promoters of this ancient "Christian Science" assumed an air of superior intelligence towards the "common Church people," and their organizations offered to many would-be clever persons an attractive refuge from the social service of the Christian Church. Thus it became a great barrier to the progress of Christian life among the educated classes. The grains of truth imprisoned in it gave vitality and strength to the heterogeneous mass of mysticism and speculation of which it consisted. To expose and refute the plausible theories, rules of magic, and mystifying hendecasyllabics of the many Gnostic sects, Irenaeus, like another St Paul, buckled on his armour. In his day Gnosticism had made great headway. In a satirical epigram composed against one Marcus Irenaeus ascribes his success to Satanic influence. It is uncertain whether the so-called "psychic" influence was used by the Gnostics, but a great deal of the results of their work might be compared with the evil consequences of modern spiritualism. A good working statement of the various

systems, the Valentinian the more elaborate, and the Marcionite the more austere, is given in Mr Harvey's commentary on the treatise.

The personality of Irenaeus was reserved but none the less attractive. The exposition of the truth as it is in Christ was his all-absorbing theme. It was to defend the truth against the misinterpretations of the Gnostics that he devoted his leisure hours. It was to spread this truth among the barbarians that he abandoned the language of culture. This he tells us not in order to parade his self-sacrifice, but to excuse the plainness of his style. Writing to his friend he says: "You must not expect from me, who am domiciled among the Keltae and am accustomed, on most occasions, to the use of their dialect, any display of rhetoric which I have never studied or beauty of diction to which I do not aspire." The love of the truth and affection for his people caused him to cross swords with the Gnostics who were leading members of his flock astray.

Church historians of every age speak in a chorus of praise of his work and character. Jerome calls him "the apostolic man"; Basil "the successor of the apostles"; Tertullian, "a most careful investigator of every doctrine." Eusebius brackets him with Clement of Alexandria as "a man equipped with the gifts of the Spirit and furnished with heavenly graces"; while Erasmus declares that "his writings breathe the early vigour of the gospel and that his speech proveth his readiness for martyrdom." But the fruits of his pastoral and missionary work are sufficient evidence of the superior quality of the man's soul. It is gratifying to reflect that this city of Lugdunum, where a common altar had been raised and a common festival instituted

to wean the Gauls from the Druidical religion, became in the succeeding centuries, through the influence and work of Irenaeus, a centre of Christian light and culture. And in the vicinity of the famous altar where the rhetorician was wont to recite his pompous speeches, which did not touch the problems of human life, the new and revivifying truth of Christ was proclaimed in no uncertain tones and the inhumanity of the Roman shows denounced[1]. And so it came to pass that when the sword of Severus was unsheathed (A.D. 202), and the blood of the Christians ran in streams through the streets, that noble spirit and those who had been trained by him for martyrdom were ready to die for the faith which was committed to the saints. In Jerome's Isaiah c. 64 Irenaeus is described as "an apostolic man, bishop and martyr," but Ephraim Syrus, Augustine, Theodoret and Cyril do not call him martyr. In the Codex Vossianus (14th cent.) of the treatise its author is styled "bishop and martyr." It is possible that he may have been confused with Irenaeus of Sirmium who perished in the Diocletian persecution (A.D. 304). Gregory of Tours, a rather credulous historian, is the first writer to give an account of his martyrdom. The *Martyrologium Romanum* makes no mention of such a martyrdom, and in his Syrian fragments there is only one doubtful instance of the title "martyr." But a short Gallican martyrology found by Massuet at St Germains in a manuscript assigned by him to the 8th century fixes the commemoration for the 28th June. If he suffered martyrdom the exact date is unknown. But it is most unlikely that so prominent a person could have escaped the sword of Severus. Jerome says that he was at the height of his

[1] *Adv. Haer.* I. 6. 3.

powers in the reign of Commodus (180—193 A.D.). It is hardly possible that he could have lived much beyond the beginning of the 3rd century, seeing that his literary labours were not finished when he died. And whether he suffered as a martyr or not he was prepared for martyrdom, his principle of life being, to use the aphorism of Whichcote, "The nearer approach to God will give us more use of ourselves."

CHAPTER II

THE TEACHERS OF IRENAEUS

A CENTURY and more of Christian thought and work had to roll past before Christian theology could be presented in a systematic form, or ever its various parts could fall into their proper position in the perspective of the whole. The work of the first two centuries was, of necessity, apologetical and polemical rather than constructive and aggressive. By the settled and the charismatic ministry, the faith had to be maintained against Jewish encroachments and Gnostic innovations. The Christians had to be kept together by an organization which reminded them of their common origin and inheritance as the Body of Christ, lest their individual tendencies should cause them to separate into a congeries of small and self-centred communities. And the sacred documents had to be sifted, preserved, and protected against the interpolations, expurgations, and interpretations of unauthorized or independent teachers. But there was an equally important work to be done, one for which special men were raised up. The rationality of the Christian revelation had to be maintained, its superiority to other religions and philosophies had to be demonstrated, and the sweet reasonableness of the faith as the crown and climax of previous aspirations

and gropings after God had to be emphasized by qualified men. And these, the Apologists, paved the way for the Theologians. In order, then, to form a tolerably fair estimate of the ecclesiastical position and importance of Irenaeus, in whose day the Church begins to emerge from the tunnel of uncertainty, a body equipped with a fairly uniform rule of faith, a generally received canon of the Old and New Testaments, a well-recognized constitution, and a well-established *raison d'être*, we must realize his indebtedness to the Christian Apologists. For the theology of Irenaeus found both introduction and basis in the work of his predecessors, while it received shape and direction from his great controversy with Gnosticism. For that controversy he was prepared by the teaching of those who had blended Christianity with culture and Christian doctrine with classical learning, and who had represented Christianity as the religion which was the only true philosophy, and as the philosophy which was the only true religion.

Accordingly, to understand the work and personality of Irenaeus we have to take into account his spiritual ancestors and the spiritual environment in which his mind grew and developed. In several directions one may trace an influence—more or less marked—of his predecessors and teachers upon his theological ideas. One might follow the traces of this influence in more detail, beginning with Hermas. In the fourth book against the Heresies[1] we have this quotation from the *Pastor* of Hermas, brother (?) of the Roman bishop Pius, A.D. 140, which is cited as Scripture: "First of all believe that there is one God, who hath made and established all things and has caused that all things

[1] 20. 2.

should come into existence from nothing, and who contains everything, but is contained by none."

The influence of the letter imputed to the "apostolic" Barnabas is as discernible in the treatise of Irenaeus as it is in the *Stromateis* of Clement of Alexandria[1], and throws light on the early connection between Rome, where Irenaeus studied, and Alexandria, where Barnabas probably lived. Compare the fifteenth chapter of the letter with the twenty-eighth chapter of Book v. The author of the epistle describes a millennium, a sabbath of a thousand years, and says: "Attend, my children, to the meaning of the words, 'He finished it in six days.' This signifies that in six thousand years the Lord will bring all things to an end. For the day with Him is a thousand years. He himself bears out my words by saying, 'To-day will be as a thousand years.' Therefore in six days, that is, in six thousand years, all things will be accomplished."

Picturing the same event, Irenaeus writes: "In as many days as this world was made, in so many thousand years shall it be finished, and, therefore, the Scripture saith, 'Thus the heaven and the earth were finished and their order. And God brought to a consummation on the sixth day all His works which He made, and rested on the seventh day from all the works which He made.' These words contain both a record of the past and a prophecy of the future. For the day of the Lord is as a thousand years, and in six days the creation was finished. It is clear, therefore, that the sixth thousand year will mark its end."

We also find in this letter the mystical interpretation in which Irenaeus delighted. Moses, according to it,

[1] *Clement of Alexandria*, p. 232. S.P.C.K.

spoke in spirit, that is, in a spiritual sense, but the Jews were led into error by a bad angel, and adopted the carnal and literal meaning of the Mosaic numbers and injunctions, which concealed spiritual truths, and thus the entire ceremonial system was the result of a misconception. In the same way Irenaeus traces the perversions of the Gnostics to the influence of malignant spirits. In the ninth chapter of this letter the author argued that Abraham's circumcision of three hundred and eighteen men prefigured the crucifixion of Jesus, I and H, the initial Greek letters of His name, representing 18, and T, the sign of the Cross, standing for 300. Similarly, Irenaeus found in the four-formed cherubim prototypes of the fourfold Gospel[1].

To pass on to Ignatius. Irenaeus seems to have been acquainted with at least the three epistles of this Father which are found in the Syriac versions. His silence regarding the passages of the Medicean revision, especially that in the letter to the Magnesians[2], which seems to answer or anticipate the Valentinian gnosis, has been urged by Cureton as an argument that he was only acquainted with the Syriac recension. In v. 28. 4 he writes with one slight variation from that recension[3]: "I am the wheat of Christ, and am ground by the teeth of wild beasts that I may be found the pure bread of God." The following passage on the Incarnation[4], "But in every respect He is man, the creation of God, and the recapitulation of humanity in Himself, the invisible become visible, the incomprehensible being made comprehensible, the impassible become passible, and the Word made man, thus summing up (*recapitulans*) all

[1] III. 11. 8.
[2] c. viii.
[3] Letter to the Romans, c. iv.
[4] III. 16. 6.

things in Himself," reminds one of the words in Ignatius' letter to Polycarp preserved in the Syriac: "Await Him who is above time, who is without time, who is invisible, but who became visible on our account, who is impalpable and impassible, but who became passible for us, and who endured in every way for us." They also seem to be a distinct echo of the pregnant words of Ignatius to the Ephesians, which are not, however, found in the Syriac[1]: "There is one Physician, in the flesh and the spirit, made and not made, God become flesh, true life in death, of Mary and of God, first passible and then impassible, even Jesus Christ onr Lord."

"There is no doubt," writes Prof. Harnack[2], "that Irenaeus, as a rule, made Jesus Christ, whom he views as God and Man, the *starting-point* of his speculation. Here he followed the Fourth Gospel and Ignatius." In his letter to the Trallians, Ignatius contends against those who denied the reality of our Lord's humanity, suffering and Divinity, thus giving Irenaeus a lead in his controversy with the Docetae. And in the Epistle to the Magnesians the same writer besought the Judaizers to lay aside the "old sour and evil leaven," words that are re-echoed by Irenaeus, in a remark on the Ebionites, "they remain in the old leaven of their birth[3]."

Furthermore, Irenaeus must have owed much to the spiritual training and teaching of his own master, Polycarp, the friend of Ignatius. Although we must not think that the theology of Irenaeus was ready-made in Asia Minor, the influence of such a personality upon the naturally susceptible mind of a youth is not to be lightly estimated. It would be surprising if the latter

[1] c. viii.
[2] *History of Dogma*, II. p. 262.
[3] v. 1. 3.

did not owe his teacher something more than "a pious regard for Church tradition and discipline." We cannot believe that the pupil's studies of the Pauline epistles[1] —the leading thoughts of which on sin, law, bondage and salvation were incorporated in his treatise—were merely forced upon him by his subsequent controversy with Marcion and the Gnostics. It would be strange if Polycarp, who quoted no less than ten of these epistles in his short letter to the Philippians, and whose mind was saturated with the theology of the missionary apostle, had not already initiated Irenaeus in the mysteries of that correspondence. Polycarp speaks of the wisdom of "the blessed and glorious Paul[2]." Irenaeus describes Peter and Paul as "most glorious" (*gloriosissimis*)[3].

In one of the fragments collected by Halloix, Irenaeus says: "By Benjamin, that is Paul, Christ was proclaimed in all the world." It is, indeed, remarkable that Irenaeus quotes frequently from the same passages of these epistles as his master, e.g. 1 Cor. vi. 9, 10 is found in Polycarp's letter to the Philippians, c. iii., and in Irenaeus, v. 27. 4, and v. 11. 1; Galatians iv. 26 is cited in Polycarp's letter, c. iii., and in Irenaeus v. 35. 2, and an echo of Philippians ii. 10 is found in Polycarp's letter c. ii.; but in Irenaeus I. 4. 2 the passage is more

[1] *Vide* Werner's *Der Paulinismus des Irenäus*. Harnack (l.c. 308), however, says there is not much in Irenaeus to remind us of Paul, because he used the moral categories, *growth* and *training*, instead of the religious ones, sin and grace. In another passage (p. 274) he says: "It is the thoughts of Paul to which Irenaeus tried to accommodate himself, without having had the same feeling about the flesh and sin as this Apostle." And (p. 236) he writes, "Irenaeus clearly sketched for it (catholic dogmatic) its fundamental idea, by combining the ancient notion of salvation with New Testament (Pauline) thoughts." And again: "A great deal of his matter, as, for instance, Pauline formulae and thoughts, he completely emptied of its content, inasmuch as he merely contrived to turn it into a testimony of the oneness and causality of God the Creator." (p. 237.)

[2] c. iii. ἐνδόξου. [3] III. 3. 2.

fully quoted. The differences are such as might naturally be found between the quotations in a letter and those in a dogmatic treatise. This letter of Polycarp is described as "most satisfactory," ἱκανωτάτη, and "one from which one may learn the character of his faith and his declaration of the truth[1]." Irenaeus is also said to have copied out the letter of the Smyrnaeans on the death of this saint[2], and although we may not accept the story that on the day and hour in which Polycarp suffered in Smyrna, Irenaeus in Rome heard a voice as of a trumpet saying, "Polycarp has borne testimony," yet we may well believe that the example and instruction of the great martyr could never have been forgotten by a pupil who loved to refer to the striking incidents of his life and the touching story of his death[3], and with whom he had been associated in boyhood's years.

A less worthy influence upon the theology of Irenaeus was exercised by Papias, Bishop of Hierapolis (A.D. 140 circ.), in Phrygia, to whom Irenaeus refers as "hearer of John[4] and companion of Polycarp," and from whose *Exposition of our Lord's Logia* he gives this extract: "The days will come when vines shall grow in such a manner that each vine shall bear ten thousand branches, each branch ten thousand twigs, each twig ten thousand shoots, and each shoot ten thousand clusters, and every cluster ten thousand grapes, and every grape shall contain five and twenty measures of wine. And when a saint shall lay hold of a cluster, another cluster shall cry out, 'I am a better cluster, take me, and bless the Lord through me.'

[1] III. 3. 4.
[2] *Vide* postscript to letter in Moscow manuscript.
[3] Letters to Victor and Florinus, and Treatise, Books II. III. 3, 4.
[4] This is a mistake. Papias was the pupil of John Presbyter. (Eus. l.c. III. 39.)

These things are credible to those who believe. And when Judas the traitor would not believe, but asked, 'How could God give such an increase?' the Lord answered: 'They shall see who shall come to those times.'" This is from the Apocalypse of Baruch.

This statement is given by Irenaeus on the authority of "presbyters who saw John, the disciple of the Lord." Eusebius, however points out[1] that Papias does not claim to have heard or seen any of the apostles, but merely declares that he tried to find out from the presbyters what had been said by Andrew, Peter, Philip, Thomas, James, John, Matthew, or any other of the disciples of our Lord, and also what Aristion and John the Presbyter had taught. Eusebius, moreover, discredits his witness, inasmuch as he was a mere collector of a mass of oral tradition, which consisted of strange parables and teachings of the Saviour and other matters of a mythical nature, such as the opinion that Christ's kingdom would be established in a material sense for the period of a thousand years after the resurrection from the dead. "But I imagine," writes Eusebius, "that he really received the apostolic statements, but did not perceive the inward meaning of them. For he was a man of very small powers, as one may judge from his writings, but his ideas influenced a large number of churchmen (ἐκκλησιαστικοί) like Irenaeus, who succeeded him and respected his authority." Eusebius may have had before his mind, when writing this passage, the well-known mistake of Irenaeus on the point of our Lord's age: "For that He was either forty or fifty years old when He taught is asserted by 'all the presbyters who had met John the disciple of the Lord in Asia, on

[1] *H. E.* III. 39.

the authority of John[1].'" This error, which has its origin probably in the remark of the Jews quoted in the Fourth Gospel, "Thou art not yet fifty years old[2]," does not prove that Irenaeus was not trustworthy, but merely that he was not infallible. It is very probable that Papias was well acquainted with Polycarp, the teacher of Irenaeus, for Smyrna would not have been too far a cry from Hierapolis for such a zealous collector of traditions.

We now come to one who seems to have given a more decided direction to the theology of Irenaeus than any of the preceding—Justin Martyr. When a young man in Rome, Irenaeus seems to have come under the spell of the master-mind of Justin, who had been a student in almost every school of philosophy in his eager desire to know God. He had tried the Stoics, the Peripatetics, the Pythagoreans, and the Platonists, but without success. At last he was brought to the light of Christianity. The first great philosopher who embraced the faith, he was, perhaps, the best equipped of all the Apologists. In his *Apology* he appeals fearlessly to reason. "In virtue of reason Socrates exposed superstition; and in virtue of the same reason Christ, 'the Socrates of the foreigners,' has done the same. In Christ reason took visible form and body. He was the Incarnate Reason of God, whereas in the poets and philosophers there was but 'the seed of reason that is the natural endowment of the whole race of man.' The latter were groping in darkness; with the former came the fulness of light. Christianity is, therefore, the highest reason." This is the teaching of the *Apology*.

[1] II. 22. 5. [2] John viii. 57.

In the *Dialogue* Christianity is represented as the only sure and saving philosophy.

It may have been from Justin that Irenaeus received his instruction in Baptismal Regeneration. The similarity of their teaching is apparent to one who compares Justin's account: "Then they are brought where water is, and are regenerated by the same regeneration by which we ourselves are regenerated," with the references that are found in Irenaeus' treatise to "the laver of regeneration" and "the regeneration that takes place by means of the laver." Writing on the Eucharist, as they called the Holy Communion, both theologians speak of a mixed cup; and declare that the bread over which thanksgiving has been made is no longer common bread (κοινὸς ἄρτος). In his controversy with Marcion and the Gnostics, Irenaeus seems to have laid this Apologist's work against Marcion under contribution. In IV. 6. 2 he writes: "Well did Justin write in his book against Marcion, 'I would not have believed the Lord Himself if He had revealed another God besides the Creator and Maker and Sustainer of men.'" Again, in the seventy-fifth chapter of his *Apology*, Justin wrote: "The evil demons, as we have shown, raised up Marcion of Pontus, who even now continues to teach men to deny God the Creator of all things in heaven and earth, and Christ His Son, who was declared by His holy prophets, and maintains that there is another God besides the Maker of all things, and also another Son." Irenaeus passes over the influence of demons, but says that Marcion uttered the most audacious blasphemy against the Father and Jesus, maintaining the former to be the author of evil, and declaring of the latter that He came from the Father, who is above the mundane God, and

that He was manifested in the form of man, and abolished the law and the prophets and the works of the Creator[1]. In another connection Irenaeus remarks: "Well did Justin say that Satan never dared to blaspheme God before our Lord's Advent, for till then he was not aware of his own damnation[2]." The influence of Justin is apparent, as Prof. Harnack[3] has pointed out, in the distinction which Irenaeus drew between the Decalogue and the ceremonial law of the Jews. And when describing the resurrection of the flesh[4], Irenaeus employs similar language and argument to that used by Justin, asking "if it is not more inconceivable *a priori* that bones, tendons, and veins and the other parts of the human organism should be made existent, and become a soul-possessing and rational being, than that having been once resolved into earth, the body should be restored to a form it once possessed[5]." The ideas of a millennium and eternal and physical punishment with other matter[6] also passed over from Justin to Irenaeus. The argument from prophecy which was employed with effect by Justin, who laid greater stress upon the fact that the miracles of Jesus were wrought in fulfilment of prophecy than that they transcended human power, was also urged by Irenaeus. Recapitulation (*ἀνακεφαλαίωσις*), an expression of Justin, used in connection with the person and work of Christ, notably in the passage quoted by Irenaeus: "Because the Only-Begotten Son came to us

[1] I. 27. 2. [2] V. 26. 2. [3] *History of Dogma*, II. 304.
[4] V. 3. 2. [5] Cf. *Apology*, c. 25.
[6] On V. 31. 1, Irenaeus quotes a text, "The Lord remembered His dead saints who before slept in the land of sepulture, and descended to them to draw them forth and to save them." Justin Martyr quoted it in his argument with Trypho, and accused the Jews of having removed it from the sacred text. It was doubtless from Justin—for it does not occur in Isaiah or Jeremiah—that Irenaeus learnt it.

from the God who made the world and orders all its concerns, *summing up* (*recapitulans*) *His own handiwork in Himself*, my faith in Him is firm and my love to the Father is constant," is frequently reset and reproduced in the Christology of Irenaeus. Another word and idea of Justin's—*αὐτεξουσία*, freedom of will, is also a favourite with Irenaeus. Justin's fancy for mystical and allegorical interpretation may also have led Irenaeus ever to *seek the type* (*quaeras typum*) when reading the Old Testament. It was as his teacher (*διδάσκαλος*), not bishop or presbyter, that Irenaeus referred to Justin. For he says, "Tatian, after Justin's death, fancied himself a teacher[1]."

Finally, Irenaeus frequently acknowledges his indebtedness to one or more presbyters. In IV. 31. 1 he says: "A presbyter speaking of the men of old time used to say, 'With regard to the faults for which the Scriptures condemn the patriarchs and prophets, we should not censure them, nor act like Ham, who ridiculed the shame of his father and so fell under a curse, but we should rather give thanks to God for them, seeing that their sins were forgiven them at the advent of our Lord; for they,' he used to say, 'give thanks for us and glory in our salvation. But with respect to those actions which the Scriptures record without comment, we ought not to pose as judges, for we are not more exacting than God, nor are we superior to our Master, but we should *seek for the type*. For not one of these things which has been written down in Scripture is *without significance* (*otiosum*).'" The principle adopted by Irenaeus in the interpretation of Scripture, namely, that "With God

[1] I. 28. 1, III. 23. 8.

there is nothing without purpose or signification[1]," is clearly a development of these last words. Who this presbyter was we can only surmise. It may have been Hegesippus, who wrote "Memoirs" (*ὑπομνήματα*). For Eusebius states[2] that Irenaeus used "the reminiscences" (*ἀπομνημονεύματα*) of a certain apostolic presbyter. Again, in IV. 27. 1 when speaking of the sins of the men of old time, he refers to a certain presbyter "who had heard from those who had seen the apostles and from those who had been their disciples, that the punishments mentioned in Scripture were sufficient for the ancients in regard to what they did without the guidance of the Spirit. For as God is no respecter of persons, He inflicted an adequate punishment on deeds that were displeasing to Him." Irenaeus then proceeds to give an account and criticism of the crimes and punishments of David and Solomon, concluding with the words: "The Scripture sufficiently reproved him, as the presbyter remarked, in order that no flesh should glory in the sight of God."

In IV. 4. 2 when affirming that God does everything by measure, he quotes from one "who well said that the immeasurable Father was Himself subjected to measure in the Son, for the Son is the measure of the Father, since He comprehends Him."

In V. 5. 1 when describing the translation of Enoch and Elias, he writes: "Wherefore the elders who were disciples of the apostles tell us that those who were translated were transferred to that place—for Paradise has been prepared for righteous men who have the Spirit—and that they shall remain there until the closing

[1] Nihil enim vacuum neque sine signo apud Deum. (IV. 21. 3.)
[2] *H. E.* V. 8.

and crowning scene, awaiting immortality." When depicting that consummation and the pilgrim's progress that shall end in glory, he again refers to the tradition of the Presbyters, the disciples of the Apostles[1].

In the second paragraph of his first Preface, Irenaeus quotes the remark made *by one better than himself* (τοῦ κρείττονος ἡμῶν) on the specious plausibility of the heretics, namely, "that even a glass imitation is often preferred to a valuable emerald." "The better man" appears again in 1. 13. 3, where we read: "as my superior hath said concerning such women," i.e. the followers of Marcus, "a bold and brazen thing is a soul, heated and puffed with mere air" (κενῷ ἀέρι θερμαινομένη). And in 1. 15. 6 he quotes the following invective against the heretic Marcus, by "the divine elder (πρεσβύτης) and herald of the truth."

> Marcus, of idols and portents the slave,
> Of magic and stars ne'er ceasing to rave,
> Seeking therein supports for thy error,
> Compassing signs for victims of terror,
> Essays of witchcraft—detested by God,
> Hallowed by Satan, thy father in fraud,
> Helped by Azazel, of goodness the foe,
> Who findeth in thee his herald of woe.

Such, he says, is the composition of "the old man beloved by God." This saintly elder might well be Pothinus, into whose diocese on the Rhone this Marcus had made incursions with deplorable results among the women.

We have found many references to individual teachers and predecessors, many germs of thought from which his own ideas were developed in the treatise of Irenaeus. We may also say, generally, that the Apologists very largely paved the way for that work by

[1] v. 36. 1, 2.

transforming the simple faith into a system of doctrine, and by casting Christianity into the form of a philosophy. Indeed, the Apologists prepared the ground for the future theologians of the Church by proving, at a time when philosophy was tending to become a religion, the reasonableness of Christian Theism, and by showing that revealed religion was the highest form in which philosophy had been as yet presented. Tatian, in his letter to the Greeks[1], summarizes the reasons that induced him to embrace the Christian faith, mentioning especially its "sweet reasonableness" (*τὸ ἐναίσιον*). "True wisdom can only be learnt of God, it depends solely on revelation," wrote Athenagoras. Christianity, according to Tatian, was too high a thing to be grasped by earthly perception, and was only to be known by revelation[2]. And the revelation of the Divine Logos in Christ surpassed the greatest light of human thought, in the opinion of Justin, who declared that "Christian doctrines were more sublime than any human philosophy, because the Christ who appeared for our sakes was the whole fulness of reason[3]."

The influence of Justin alone upon Irenaeus can never be measured. The master who kept Tatian straight—for it was only after Justin's death that Tatian became a heretic[4]; the apologist who compiled the first treatise or *syntagma* on the faith, who spoke of the Incarnation as a recapitulation of the Creation, who emphasized the freedom of man's will and the responsibility of his actions, and whose eschatological hopes, Messianic reading of Scripture, and controversy with Marcion were handed on to his pupil, must have played

[1] 29.
[2] *Orat.* 12.
[3] *Apol.* II. 10.
[4] Irenaeus I. 28. 1.

no little part in moulding the mind and training the intelligence of one who had seen and heard the saintly Polycarp in the early days of his youth, and so had drunk deeply and in many places of the Apostolic spring. With this preparatory work of the Apologists may be compared the movement of the Cambridge Platonists, which Tulloch[1] describes as "the first elaborate attempt to wed Christianity and philosophy made by any Protestant school." One of these, Whichcote, who resembled Irenaeus in mind and spirit, said: "I receive the truth of the Christian religion in way of illumination, affection and choice....I have no reason against it, yea, the highest and purest reason is for it."

[1] *Rat. Theol.*, Vol. II. p. 13.

CHAPTER III

THE TREATISE AGAINST THE HERESIES

In the preceding chapter we have described the influence exercised upon the theology of Irenaeus by his spiritual predecessors and teachers, Polycarp, and Justin, and other Apologists. These men had, as we have seen, prepared the ground for Irenaeus and his successors by representing Christianity as the religion which was the only true philosophy and the philosophy which was the only true religion. Their previous training in dialectics and logic had equipped them for the work of proving the reasonableness of Christian Theism and revelation to the educated, and that work was the starting-point of all future endeavours among the circles of the learned.

There were many men, however, blunt persons like Marcion, and dreaming souls like Valentinus, who attempted to discover a *modus vivendi* between a philosophy they did not wish to discard and a religion they were loth to deny. New developments and problems were started within the very pale of Christianity by this desire to find points of contact and methods of reconciliation between Christianity and other religions and philosophical systems. The result was Gnosticism, of which Tertullian wrote: "Away with all attempts to produce a motley Christianity, compounded of Stoicism, Platonism, and Dialectics. Possessing Jesus Christ, we need no curious disputation; after enjoying the Gospel, we require no

philosophical inquiries." While it may be an exaggeration to say with Harnack of these Gnostics, "they were, in short, the theologians of the second century[1]," we may not forget that it was through them that "studies, literature, and art were introduced into the Church[2]." They may have been "the first to work up tradition systematically," but they cannot be said to have handled religious subjects with reserve and patience. For while the Apologists, the early defenders of the faith, were content to represent it as a philosophy of life and a revelation of divine truth, the Gnostics converted Christianity into a theosophy and a Christian science, in many points resembling that which now bears the name, with an answer for every question under the sun. The Church's controversy with the Gnostics, however, helped it to work out its faith in terms of a creed. For though it was speculation carried beyond reasonable limits into spheres of being, utterly unknown and incomprehensible, it was carried thither in the interests of knowledge and in the hope of attaining completeness of thought and arrangement. The origin of things was set forth in a plausible system, in which the complexities of creation were apparently simplified by the theory of the Pleroma and its emanations. Such an attempt—extravagant and puerile as it may seem—to solve the problems of life by the aid of the imagination was made by those who have, and justly have, the credit of being the first to grapple with questions of the highest importance to Christian students. The theology of Irenaeus must therefore be regarded as the outcome of this struggle with Gnosticism as well as the spiritual inheritance of his age. For by it he was

[1] Cf. *History of Dogma* II. 304 Eng. Trans., "the oldest theologians (the Gnostics)."

[2] Baumgarten-Crusius, *Dogmen-Geschichte*; see Dorner I. 357.

eventually led to occupy, as has been well said, "a middle position between the renunciation of all knowledge and the attempt to fathom the depths of the Godhead." And it was the direct cause of his undertaking his great work against the heresies.

This work, "The Refutation of the Heresies, or the Treatise against the Heresies," by Irenaeus, is one of the most interesting and important remains of early Christianity. It undoubtedly owes its unique position in the library of the Church to the loss of Justin's *Syntagma* or treatise against all the heresies, and of Hegesippus' work on the Apostolic Kerygma in five books[1], on which it was evidently modelled. But it is not merely an exposure of the false tenets of the Gnostic schools, but also an exposition of the true doctrine of the Church. In the first of the five books into which the work is divided, the Gnostic theories are described, in the second they are refuted, and in the three concluding books the Christian truth is set forth. The first two books are not within the range of the ordinary reader, inasmuch as they discuss abstruse metaphysics and abstract speculations. For in their efforts to reconcile the finite and the infinite, to account for the origin of evil, and to construct a theory of creation which would explain both revelation and redemption, the Gnostic philosophers abandoned or perverted the teaching of Scripture. Accordingly, we find, as in the modern systems of Swedenborg, Mrs Baker G. Eddy, and Mrs Annie Besant, the most wonderful statements and bewildering arguments evolved from the inner consciousness of their authors. Indeed, we might say in general that Swedenborgianism and its "correspondences,"

[1] Euseb. *H. E.* IV. 8.

Theosophy and its "planes," Christian Science and its "delusions," are but revivals of certain aspects of ancient Gnostic thought in modern dress. The danger of the ancient systems, like that of the modern ones, consisted not so much in the mass of error they concealed as in the grains of truth they contained. "The specious fraud of the heretics plausibly tricked out with borrowed plumes might," as Irenaeus said in an eloquent passage, "easily beguile the more simple to accept it as truth, just as, to quote the expression of one more excellent than myself, the precious emerald is sometimes thrown into the shade by a clever imitation in glass. Accordingly, lest any should be led astray by wolves in lamb's clothing, who use the same words as we do, but not in the same sense, I have considered it to be my duty, after reading some of the so-called commentaries of the school of Valentinus, and after making myself master of their tenets by frequent intercourse with people of that sect, to unmask their profound and egregious mysteries to you, my dear friend, so that you on your part may expose them to all your people and warn them against the 'depth (*bythos*) of folly[1].'"

The following references to his own literary labours found in the prefaces of the last three books against the heresies throw an interesting light on the composition: iii. Praef. "You asked me, dear friend, to explain the hidden doctrines of Valentinus, and to expose their variety in a treatise against them. I have, accordingly, undertaken to demonstrate their origin from Simon, the father of heretics, and to confute their theories. The first book is occupied with their opinions and customs. In the next their arguments and reasons are answered

[1] Praef. I. 2.

and vanquished. While in this, the third, Scriptural proofs will be given, so that you may be armed *cap-à-pie* for an encounter with them. If you remember what I have already written, you will have a full and complete refutation of all the heresies. And it behoves you to resist them with confident assurance on behalf of the only true and living faith which the Church has learnt from the Apostles and given to her sons." iv. Praef. "In sending you, dear comrade, this fourth book of my treatise on the Detection and Refutation of False Knowledge, I shall add the weight of our Lord's words to what has already been advanced, that you may be able to save men from making shipwreck of their souls in deep waters. For he who would confute them must understand their tenets (*regulae*) and arguments, just as a physician must understand the disease he would heal. My predecessors though better men than myself were not adequately equipped to meet the followers of Valentinus because they did not know their tenets." v. Praef. "In this, the fifth book of the Exposure and Confutation of Knowledge falsely so called, I shall try to furnish proofs from other portions of our Lord's teaching and from the letters of the Apostles, that so you may be fully prepared to withstand the heretics, to convert the wanderers to the Church of God, and to establish the neophytes in the sound faith which is guarded by the Church."

This undertaking is acknowledged by the ancient Fathers to have been as successful as it was meritorious. Epiphanius, in his work against the heretics[1], declares that "Irenaeus, the successor of the Apostles, exposed in a wonderful manner the folly and madness of Basilides." And again he says: "That elder, adorned with every

[1] 24. 8.

spiritual grace, was equipped like an athlete for the fray, with heavy weapons, and overcame and refuted by sheer faith and knowledge all their falsehoods[1]." And Hippolytus[2] of Portus wrote a book against all heresies, which was based upon this work of Irenaeus, according to Photius. It was as a Scripture theologian that Irenaeus had most weight. His acquaintance with the Scriptures at that early date was marvellous. For instance, he quotes the principal passages both of the Old Testament and the New on blood, in the fourteenth chapter of the fifth book. And from a literary point of view the work, in spite of the unattractive character of the Latin translation, is interesting. Although he keeps his own personality in the background, his wit is so keen, his illustrations so apt, his explanation so clear, his language so epigrammatic, and his piety so profound that there is not a dull page in the treatise. The similes of the sunlight, the bank, the hunt, the mosaic, the sponge, the patch-work robe, the flower-pot, the false gem, the artist, and the cisterns are among the best known. Bright flashes of wit coruscate through the gloom of controversy, and irony and humour considerably lighten the weight of the argument. Conscious of the force of gentle ridicule, he compares the heretics, in II. 2. 1, with the dog of Aesop which dropped the bread while making an attempt to seize its shadow. The badly assorted ideas of the Gnostics are likened to a motley garment of many rags[3]. "It is not necessary to

[1] *Haeres.* 31. 33. "We are justified in saying," writes Dr Harnack, "that the five books 'adv. haereses' of Irenaeus were successful, for we can prove the favourable reception of the work and the effects it had in the 3rd and 4th centuries (for instance, on Hippolytus, Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria, Victorinus, Marcellus of Ancyra, Epiphanius, and Athanasius)." Op. cit. II. 237.

[2] *Cod.* 121.

[3] II. 14. 2.

swallow the ocean," he says, "in order to learn that the water is salt[1]." The Gnostics "stride forth like game-cocks with eyebrows in air[2]"; while their system is to be compared with a clay statue covered with gold leaf[3]. When concluding his description of the thirty aeons of the Valentinians which were evolved from Bythos and Sige, he says: "Such are the thirty aeons of this system which are 'buried in Sige' (silence)[4]," and in II. 12. 8 he declares the whole system "ends in Bythos, that is a bottomless pit." He does not understand how Sige (silence) can exist in the presence of Logos (speech), or how Logos can manifest himself in the presence of Sige[5]. He scornfully asks the Gnostics why they seek after God, seeing that He is unknown and unknowable (according to their own system). Furthermore, the labour of those who work through these volumes is rewarded by side-lights that are thrown by them upon the faith and teaching of the early Church. There are many important passages upon the rule of faith (*regula fidei*). It is, indeed, remarkable that a creed almost similar in sublime phrase and logical order to the creed of Nicaea and Chalcedon, and in historical setting to the Apostles' creed, might easily be reconstructed from the writings of Irenaeus. To the critical student the treatise is peculiarly valuable, containing, as it does, important references, direct and indirect, to the Gospels, Epistles and Apocalypse, and some distinctly western readings which are also found in Codex Bezae. These will be mentioned in their proper place. Suffice it to mention here that Irenaeus gives a reading of which Dr Sanday[6] says, "though very possibly and perhaps probably the

[1] II. 19. 8. [2] II. 15. 2. [3] II. 19. 8.
[4] I. 1. 3. [5] II. 12. 5. [6] *Inspiration*, p. 34.

right one, is not now found in a single Greek MS." It occurs in III. 16. 1, and is part of Matt. i. 18—"Now the birth of Christ (Jesus Christ A.V. and R.V.) was on this wise." This reading, according to Irenaeus, was distinctly directed by the Spirit, in view of the heresy which separated the man Jesus from the aeon Christ.

Furthermore, there are interesting references to the sacramentarian views and the Church organization of the first two centuries in the treatise. But it is much to be regretted that a large portion of his work, like the *First Principles* of Origen, is only extant in a Latin translation, and that the text is uncertain in many passages owing to the loss of the principal manuscripts. Moreover, the difficulty of introducing this work to the notice of modern readers is considerably enhanced by the uncertainty of the Greek and the rude idiom of the Latin version, which has the merit, however, of being literal. Fortunately we are able to reconstruct a considerable part of the Greek from the numerous quotations we find in subsequent writers, such as Hippolytus, Eusebius, and Epiphanius.

The work was composed originally in the Greek language[1]. Eusebius and Photius quote from Irenaeus as a Greek author. And Jerome, the highest authority on Latin theology, when reviewing the writers who favoured Millenarian views, expressly excludes Irenaeus from the number of Latin authors and includes him among the Greek. "Of the Latins," he writes, "I may mention Tertullian, Victorinus, and Lactantius, and of the Greeks, passing by others, Irenaeus, Bishop of Lugdunum." In another passage the same theologian,

[1] The almost universal language in early theological writings of the time. Hippolytus, Bishop of Portus, also wrote in Greek.

after mentioning the names of Tertullian, Lactantius, Victorinus and Severus, says: "And to cite the Greek writers, the first and last together, Irenaeus and Apollinarius." Erasmus, in his edition of Irenaeus, says it is doubtful whether Jerome was alluding to the nationality or the language of Irenaeus. But Jerome evidently meant that Irenaeus was a Greek in the same sense in which Tertullian was a Latin Father. A glance at the Greek text, wherever it has been preserved, shows that it is sufficiently idiomatic and clear, while the Latin is equally rough and obscure. It would be difficult, therefore, to believe that Jerome was referring to the Latin text when he wrote in his letter to Theodora that the books of Irenaeus against the heresies were couched in eloquent and scholarly language. The very idiom is Greek. For example, we find a well-known Greek expression reset in the incorrect Latin, "latuit semetipsum incidens[1]." We also have the word *prophetes*[2]. The writer of the Latin text, if Pearson's conjecture is true, in I. 11. 3, translated the name Epiphanes by "clarus." Moreover, the number of titles of the treatise found in the Latin seems due to a translator's uncertainty rather than to an author's. Furthermore, nearly all the quotations—which are few—are from the Greek classics, chiefly Homer, although it is true that we find distant echoes of Horace. And if the author had written originally in Latin he would have written Latinus not Lateinos. There is, however, no need to elaborate this point. The Greek text lay before Hippolytus, Theodoret, Epiphanius, and Eusebius, and is thought to have been in existence until the ninth century.

But if the possibility of a second edition in Latin by

[1] II. 33. 2. [2] IV. 20. 12.

the author himself—which seems not less remote than that of a second Lukan text—be not admitted, we cannot fail to recognize the antiquity and invaluable literalness of the Latin version.

It may have been made before Tertullian's work against Valentinus (circ. 200), in which a Latin version showing many resemblances, especially in the matter of mistakes, is quoted. Cyprian, the pupil of Tertullian, seems to have had the same version before him when writing to Pompeius about Marcion and Cerdo. And Augustine, who was not a Greek scholar, in his work *On Original Sin* against Julianus Pelagianus, quotes the passage IV. 2. 7, almost word for word from the Latin text, writing: "Irenaeus, Bishop of Lugdunum, lived close to the Apostolic times. He says: 'There is no other way to salvation from the old infection of the Serpent unless men believe on Him who, in the likeness of the flesh of sin, was exalted on the tree of martyrdom, drew all men to Himself and gave life to the dead.'" The translation may have been made by one of Irenaeus' clergy, or a successor in his see. The MSS. of the Latin seem to have all come from that quarter. Professor Loofs[1], who writes as an authority upon these manuscripts, declares that Massuet was correct in saying that the translation was made before Tertullian's *Adv. Valent.*, and assigns a hypothetical original to A.D. 200 (circiter).

The treatise, which Professor Harnack[2] considers "far superior to the theological writings of Tertullian," was undertaken at the request of a friend, and appears to have been written in parts and to have extended over a

[1] Loofs, Prof. Friedrich, *Die Handschriften der Lateinischen Uebersetzung*, pp. 59, 60—62.
[2] l.c. p. 236.

great number of years. Certain allusions in it enable us to form some idea of the time of its composition. In III. 21. 1 the author refers to Theodotion's version[1], which, according to Epiphanius[2], was published in the second year of the reign of Commodus (180—192 A.D.), and, according to the Chronicon Paschale, in the consulship of Marcellus and Aelianus (184 A.D.). This portion of the work may, therefore, have been written after that date, although it is quite possible that this version may have been known to and used by Irenaeus previous to its general publication. In III. 3. 3, when giving the list of the Roman bishops, he mentions Eleutherus, who, according to Eusebius[3], was Bishop of Rome between A.D. 177 and A.D. 190. In III. 11 he also alludes to the heresy of Montanus, with reference to which he made a journey to Rome in A.D. 177. And he speaks of the successors of Polycarp in the see of Smyrna[4], "Qui usque adhuc successerunt Polycarpo." There is also a reference to the heresy of Tatian, which, he says, was not made known until after Justin's death[5]. These are landmarks upon which, however, no definite statement can be built. It is probable that the work extended over a great number of years, that it was commenced during his presbyterate (long before A.D. 177); that a great amount of the material had been collected in Rome during his early sojourn there; and that it was not completed until long after the year 184 A.D. Jerome tells us that Irenaeus was in the prime of his life in the reign of Commodus (A.D. 180—192).

[1] See Art. *Septuagint*, Hastings' *D. B.*

[2] *On Measures* XVII.

[3] *H. E.* Pref. v. "Eleutherus succeeds in the seventeenth year of Antoninus Verus." Also *H. E.* v. 22, "In the tenth year of Commodus and after his thirteen years term of office Victor succeeded Eleutherus."

[4] III. 3. 4. [5] I. 18. 1.

With regard to the title of the work there is also much vagueness. Photius declares in his *Bibliotheca* that "the inscription is:—*λόγοι πέντε ἐλέγχου καὶ ἀνατροπῆς τῆς ψευδωνύμου γνώσεως*." Eusebius[1] gives it the same title. There is, however, a shorter form which Photius also gives and which is found in Eusebius[2]; "the books against the heresies" (*πρὸς τὰς αἱρέσεις*), and in Cyril's Catechetical Lectures[3], where we read: "in the treatise against the heresies" (*πρὸς τὰς αἱρέσεις*). Of this shorter but newer form the Latin *Contra Haereses* or *Adversus Haereses* (Jerome) is a translation. The Latin rendering of the passage in the preface to the fourth book—"De detectione et eversione falsae cognitionis"—shows that Irenaeus gave this work the heavier title for which the simpler name *Contra Haereses* or *Haereticos* was afterwards adopted. For example, the heading of the preface of the first book of the Arundel manuscript is "Praefatio hyrenei lucdunensii episcopi contra hereticos." The title of the Clermont (C) is "Hireneus Lugdunensis episcopus contra omnes hereses"; and that of the Voss (V) is "Hirenei episcopi Lugdunensis contra omnes hereticos libri numero quinque."

With regard to the classification of the Latin documents, Dr Loofs' pamphlet[4] is to be consulted. As Stieren pointed out in his edition, there are two principal families of the Latin translation, the one represented by the Clermont and Voss MSS. and the other by the Arundel MS. Some years ago Cardinal Pitra, librarian of the Vatican, discovered four Roman MSS., two parchment codices, Vat. 188, and Ottobon. 752, and two

[1] *H. E.* v. 7. [2] *H. E.* III. 23. [3] 18.
[4] Leipzig, 1890.

paper MSS., Vat.. 187 and Ottobon. 1154. But these MSS. are shown by Professor Loofs to be junior members of the Arundel family. It is to be remembered that Erasmus used three copies of the text, one sent to him by John Faber, and the other two lent from a monastery. Latinus Latinius, 1513—1593, worked upon another manuscript which is now called the Vatican. Feuardent speaks of another which the Parisian, Jean de Saint André, lent him, and from which he copied the concluding five chapters of the treatise. Grabe employed the Arundel MS., a list of the readings from the excellent manuscripts of Isaac Voss, and a copy of variant readings made by Mercer from two unknown manuscripts. Professor Loofs had the Codex Vossianus before him. Massuet used three manuscripts, one belonging to the College of Clermont, another copied by the hand of Passeratius, and a third in the possession of Cardinal Ottobon. Stieren preferred the Vossian, but Harvey thought more of the Arundel. After a comparison of the MSS., as regards writing, readings, use of abbreviations, and Greek capitals, division of chapters, and omission or insertion of arguments, Professor Loofs compiled a genealogical table ascribing the Clermont to the ninth century, the Arundel to the thirteenth, and the Vossian to the fourteenth[1]. He also points out that the oldest Roman MSS., the Vatican and the Ottobon, were in all probability written in the South of France, being brought from that country by Thomas Parentucelli (circ. 1435), afterwards Nicholas V. Professor Loofs does not hold it impossible that the arguments of the five books were from the pen of Irenaeus. In V^1, he points out, there are Greek capitals for numbers instead of Roman in

[1] p. 80.

the second book, and the arguments appear to be a translation from the Greek[1]. He throws light on the interest England has always taken in Irenaeus, by identifying the old manuscript employed by Feuardent with the Voss, which was called after Isaac Voss, a learned Canon of Windsor, in whose possession it was after Feuardent procured it from Jean de Saint André. He would also identify the Clermont MS. with an Irenaeus which Delisle found in the catalogue of the famous library of the monastery of Corbie, and which probably then passed into the hands of the Jesuits of Clermont, and is now in the possession of Mr John Fenwick, son-in-law of Sir John Phillips, who purchased it from the Jesuits. The Arundel manuscript, the principal member of the second family of these MSS., was purchased (most probably from the library of Willibald Pirkheimer) by Thomas Earl of Arundel (1636), became the property of the Duke of Norfolk, his grandson, was presented by him to the Royal Society (1681), and since 1831 is in the British Museum.

The dawn of the Reformation witnessed a great revival of studies in the work of Irenaeus, who was regarded by Reformers as the great patristic authority on the Eucharist. The interpretations of the treatise are, accordingly, as conflicting as they are numerous, Franciscans, Jesuits, Calvinists and Lutherans claiming an advocate for their special views in the author. And the controversy grew so warm between the Romans and the Lutherans that it is alleged and as it appears proved that Pfaff (1715) made use of certain unauthentic fragments to support his case. The principal editions were brought out by Erasmus (1526), Feuardent, Gallasius of

[1] p. 61.

Geneva (with Greek text from Epiphanius), Grabe (with fragments published at Oxford, 1702), Massuet (1710, reprinted by Migne, 1857), Stieren (1853), and Harvey of Cambridge (1857). Harvey collated for his edition the Clermont and Arundel MSS. of the Latin text, and gives interesting facsimiles of the two manuscripts, the former of which is written in a bold Italian hand and the latter in a heavy Flemish style. He points out that the former ends abruptly at v. 26, and that the readings of the Arundel represent a different family of codices. Harvey, who held that Syriac was the native tongue of Irenaeus, also made use of a Syriac translation. He shows that Grabe and Massuet did their work faithfully. There are also fragments of an Armenian interpolated version first published by Cardinal Pitra in his *Spicilegium Solesmense*[1].

The treatise was regarded as a standard work on the heresies in Church circles of the third century. Tertullian's work, *De Praescriptionibus adversus Haereses*[2], written some twenty years after this treatise (circ. 200 A.D.) with all the fervid rhetoric of an advocate, was based upon it. The same arguments against the innovations of the heretics are put forward in the form of legal demurrers, and the constancy and continuity of the Church discipline and doctrine are maintained with the same zeal. "For wherever there is the truth of discipline and Christian faith, there is the truth of the Scriptures, interpretations and all Christian traditions[3]." The catalogue of the heresies, which is clearly based on Irenaeus' work, and is contained in cc. 45—53 of the *De Praescriptionibus*, is not considered by Tillemont to belong to the work, but to be the composition of a contemporary of the author. It is also to be read with the treatise of

[1] tom. I. [2] *Vide* c. 45. [3] c. 19.

Irenaeus. Furthermore, if we may draw an inference from the favourable reception of the treatise by the Greek and Latin Fathers, it would seem that it rightly deserved the high position it afterwards received in the library of the Church. The writings of Hippolytus, who continued his master's polemic against the heretics in his *Philosophoumena* or *Refutation of all the Heresies*, bear many traces of the influence of its teaching. Hippolytus, however, throws the veil of charitable silence over the doings of the Gnostics. He is not so outspoken as Irenaeus. In one fragment of this author we find Irenaeus' idea of the Incarnation as *Recapitulatio*, and in another the opinion is expressed that Antichrist was to spring from the tribe of Dan[1]. In several passages, e.g. the account of Simon Magus[2], the text of Irenaeus is supplied from the *Philosophoumena* of Hippolytus. Generally speaking, short sentences such as the following:

Obedience to God is immortality[3];

It is the glory of man to be the servant of God[4];

The vision of God confers incorruption[5];

God is superior to nature; and has the Will because He is good; the Power because He is Almighty, and the Performance because He is rich[6];

A living man is the glory of God, but the vision of God is the life of man[7];

The Word became what we are to make us what He is[8];

The Word became man that man might possess the Word[9];

[1] After Irenaeus v. 30. 2.
[2] I. 23. 1.
[3] IV. 38. 3.
[4] IV. 14. 1.
[5] IV. 38. 3.
[6] II. 29. 2.
[7] IV. 20. 7.
[8] V. *Praef.*
[9] III. 19. 1.

The Son of God became the Son of Man that man might become the son of God[1].

have left an indelible impress upon the devotional literature of the Church. In the mystic strains of Augustine, in the luminous thoughts of Henry Vaughan, and not least in the pious aphorisms of Benjamin Whichcote, who lived like Irenaeus in making up differences, and in the spirit of his own words, "Heaven is first a temper, then a place," and "Heaven present is resemblance to God," we find much that reminds us of the jewels "five words long" that stud this monumental work.

[1] III. 10. 2.

CHAPTER IV

THE EDUCATION OF MAN

IRENAEUS writes in an interesting and instructive manner upon the Divine guidance of man. Taught by philosophy and observation that the principle of life is growth, he learnt from the Scriptures that the life of man is a step-by-step education, a gradual forming of character under the hand of the Word, Who has been with man from the beginning, and by the ministry of evil, which receives a teleological significance when regarded as a preparation for life and advance towards God and perfection.

In IV. 11. 2, he lays down the fundamental principle which has necessitated the progressive form of man's education. "God makes, but man is made. While He Who makes is ever the same, that which is made receives beginning and middle, addition and increase. God, indeed, is the benefactor, and man is the receiver of the benefit. But whereas He is truly perfect in all things, and always equal to and like Himself and the source of all that is good, man receives increase and advancement in the direction of God. For as God is always the same, man, when found in God, shall ever advance towards Him." This essential difference between man and God lies at the root of the gradual method of the Divine education

of man, and is the source of man's perpetual aspiration after perfection and God.

In IV. 11. 1, Irenaeus thus describes the gradual nature of the Divine education in the history of man: "How could the Scriptures testify of Him unless all things had been made manifest to the believing by one and the same God through the Word? God at one time held converse with His creatures, at another He gave forth His law; at one time He reproved, at another exhorted, and afterwards set man free and adopted him as a son, and at the proper time bestowed upon him the inheritance of incorruption in order to bring him to perfection. For He intended man to grow and increase, as the Scripture saith, 'increase and multiply.'"

The brightening prospect before man is thus painted in IV. 5. 1: "God is one and the same, Who rolls up the heaven like a book, and renews the face of the earth; Who made the things of time for man, that, growing to maturity in them, man may have the fruition of immortality; and Who showers eternal gifts upon men, that "in the ages to come He might display the ineffable riches of His grace."

In V. 29. 1, he again refers to his favourite theme, God's concern for man. "The things of this life have been created for the sake of man, who is intended for salvation, that God (?) may prepare and mature for immortality, and render more adapted to the service of God, him who is the possessor of free will. The creation was made for man, not man for the creation."

In IV. 38, 1, discussing the question, why God should not have created man perfect from the first, he says: "Rest assured that God, as far as He is concerned, could have done so; for all things are possible with Him, but

His creature, man, who was necessarily imperfect, infantile, and untrained in the perfect discipline, could not have received this perfection owing to his weakness, just as a babe cannot receive stronger nourishment than milk.... It was with reference to this very principle that St Paul says to the Corinthians, 'I have fed you with milk, not with meat, for hitherto ye were not able to bear it.'"

In this same book and chapter he gives a vivid outline of man's career in grace, and from weakness unto strength, in the form of a climax. "It was morally necessary (ἔδει) that man should, in the first place, be created, and, having been created, should grow, and having grown, should reach man's estate, and having done so, should receive strength, and having got strength, should be glorified, and having been glorified, should see God." An equally graphic description of God's education is found in IV. 37. 7: "God has shown long-suffering during the apostasy of man, and man has been trained by it, as the prophet says, 'Thy apostasy shall reform thee.' For God arranged everything from the first with a view to the perfection of man, in order to edify him and reveal His own dispensations, so that goodness may be made manifest, justice made perfect, and the Church may be fashioned after the image of His Son. Thus man may eventually reach maturity, and, being ripened by such privileges, may see and comprehend God."

It was in keeping with his view of human life as a growth that Irenaeus held the opinion that Adam and Eve were not of full age when created[1]. "For they first grew up and then they multiplied." It was for man's

[1] III. 22. 4.

sake, not for God's glory, "that man was created from the earth to which we belong[1]." "In the beginning God formed Adam, not because He stood in need of man, but that He might have some one to receive His benefits[2]." The secret of man's creation, education and salvation is, therefore, the love of God for man. "It was His benevolence that induced Him to create us[3]," "it was the exceeding great love of the Son for us that led Him to become incarnate[4]," "nor did He need our service when He ordered us to follow Him; but He thus conferred salvation on us[5]."

God's thoughtful and loving consideration is described in an eloquent passage[6], where we read: "He chose the patriarchs, indeed, for their salvation, and trained the people carefully, teaching the intractable ones to follow Him by preparing the prophets and accustoming man to bear His Spirit, and to hold communion with Him. He Himself needed nought, but granted communion with Himself to those who sought it; sketching, as an artist, the plan of salvation for those who pleased Him. He guided those who did not see in Egypt, and to those who became disobedient in the desert He gave a most suitable law, while upon the people who entered the good land he bestowed a worthy inheritance, and He killed the fatted calf for those who turned to the Father. Thus, by a great variety of ways, He led the human race to salvation[7]. The Word passing through all these men conferred generous benefits upon His subjects, and drew up a code adapted to every condition of life."

In the following paragraph he thus describes in an

[1] v. 16. 1. [2] IV. 14. 1. [3] IV. 14. 2.
[4] v. *Praef.* [5] IV. 14. 1. [6] IV. 14. 2.
[7] 'ad consonantiam salutis,' i.e. into the harmony of salvation.

effective climax the educational purposes of the Jewish rites and ceremonies: "On the same principle God appointed the construction of the tabernacle and the building of the Temple, the election of the Levites, the sacrifices and oblations and all the other service of the law, although He needed none of these things Himself. Besides this, He gave the people instruction, appealing to them to persevere and serve God and abstain from idols, calling them by things of secondary to things of primary importance, by types to realities, by things temporal to things eternal, by the carnal to the spiritual, and by the earthly to the heavenly." The progressive morality of the Old Testament is described in words to this effect: "For when the natural precepts of the Decalogue proved insufficient to restrain man from abusing his liberty, then the Law of Moses was given, in which certain concessions were given to the people that they might be drawn on by the appointed ordinances to the gift of salvation. But perfect righteousness was not conferred by the circumcision or by any other legal ceremony which was established merely to lead the people to keep the Decalogue in the spirit and in the letter[1]." "The Decalogue enjoins love of God, Who prepares man, through the Decalogue, for His friendship and for brotherly love[2]."

The provisional and preparatory nature of the Law is a favourite subject with Irenaeus. "Certain precepts were, therefore, added by Moses because of the hardness of their hearts. But what shall we say of the Old Testament when the same is found in the New? And if in the New the Apostles made certain concessions to human weakness, we cannot wonder that in the Old

[1] IV. 15. [2] IV. 16. 3.

Testament times God wished a similar course to be followed for the advantage of the people, drawing them on by prescribed observances to the salvation which was promised in the Decalogue, and to His love[1]." "God gave circumcision as a sign, not as the consummation of righteousness[2]." "Abraham himself was without circumcision, and did not know of the sabbath observances when he believed in God[3]." "Why, then, did God not give His covenant to the fathers? Because the law is not appointed for the righteous. For the righteous fathers had the spirit of the law written in their hearts and souls, loving God, Who made them, and abstaining from injustice to their neighbours. But when the righteousness and love ceased and passed into oblivion in Egypt, God, of necessity, and by reason of His great love, manifested Himself by His voice, and brought out the people by His mighty arm, so that man might once more be the pupil and follower of God[4]." "For man had not the glory of God, and could only attain to it by obedience to God. And therefore Moses said: 'Choose life, that thou mayest live and thy seed, to love the Lord thy God, to hear His voice and to cleave to Him, for this is thy life and the length of thy days.' Preparing man for this life, the Lord, in His own person, addressed to all the words of the Decalogue, and therefore do they abide permanently, receiving from His advent in the flesh extension and development, but not abrogation[5]."

The Gospel is an advance beyond the morality of the Law. "God, indeed, cancelled the things which were given for bondage and were signs, by the new covenant of liberty, but, on the other hand, He gave larger scope and meaning to the laws which are natural,

[1] IV. 15. 2. [2] IV. 16. 1. [3] IV. 16. 2. [4] IV. 16. 3. [5] IV. 16. 4.

noble and universal, granting to men, by means of the adoption, a fuller and more liberal knowledge of God the Father, so that they may love Him with the whole heart, follow Him unswervingly, abstain from evil deeds and wrong desires, and reverence Him, not as slaves, but as sons revere and love their father[1]."

We grow from faith to faith as we advance from a lower level of morality to a higher. "For as in the New Testament that faith which is toward God receives fresh increase and subject-matter in the Son of God, so that man may be a partaker of God; so also our walk in life must be more diligent, seeing that we are ordered not merely to abstain from evil deeds, but from evil thoughts and improper conversation. Whereas the punishment of those who regard not God is ever increasing, being not temporal but eternal, they who inherit the Kingdom of God make advance in it; for there is one and the same God the Father and His Word, Who has always been present with the human race, and by means of His various dispensations has wrought much and saved all who from the beginning are saved, that is, all who love God and follow the Word according to their light[2]." In one sentence, fitting and epigrammatic, Irenaeus sums up his argument: "For there is one salvation and one God, but the precepts which educate man are many, and the steps which lead to God are not a few[3]."

In IV. 20. 8 Irenaeus speaks more particularly of the educational work of the Holy Spirit, Who formed and adapted us beforehand that we might be made subject to God, and describes the gradualness and naturalness of His method in giving us a previous training and discipline

[1] IV. 16. 5. [2] IV. 28. 2. [3] IV. 9. 3.

for a reception into that glory which shall be afterwards revealed in those who love God.

This view of life, moral and spiritual, as educational, much superior to the theory of life as mere probation, is the very backbone of the system of Irenaeus' anthropology, running through it as the warp through the woof. So much so, that the disobedience of man, commonly known as the Fall, assumes a teleological significance in this system. As Professor Wendt says: "The original destination of man was not abrogated by the Fall, the truth rather being that the Fall was intended as a means of leading men to attain this perfection to which they were destined." "Man, indeed," writes Irenaeus, "though by nature the property of God, was alienated from Him contrary to nature[1]." "But this temporary alienation served the kind purpose (*magnanimitas*) of God that man, passing through all experiences, and acquiring the knowledge of moral discipline, and being raised from the dead, and learning in his own life what is the source of his deliverance, may always prove grateful to the Lord, Who hath given him the gift of incorruptibility, and may love Him more, on the principle that "he to whom more is forgiven loveth more[2]." "For strength is made perfect in weakness, and he is a better man who through his own frailty finds out the power of God. For how could a man have learned that he himself is a weak creature, and doomed to die, but that God is immortal and all-powerful, had he not been taught by experience those two facts? There is nothing wrong in learning one's weakness by suffering, but it is still better not to go astray at all. But presumption against God has brought much evil upon man by

[1] V. 1. 1. [2] III. 20. 2.

rendering him ungrateful to God. Man must, therefore, learn by experience, lest he fail in his duty to the truth and in his love to God[1]."

In III. 20. 1 he says: "When man fell into sin God exercised magnanimity, foreseeing the victory which was to be gained for Him through the Word, and so He permitted man to be swallowed up by that great sea monster, not that he might utterly perish, but that he might be more subject to God, Who was preparing the plan of salvation which was made by the Word through the sign of Jonas."

Writing on the knowledge of good and evil, which he declared were necessary to complete human experience, he said: "Through the generosity of God man is aware both of the good of obedience and the evil of disobedience, so that the eye of the mind, gaining experience of both, may with judgement make choice of the better things, and man may never become indolent or neglectful of God's command. Thus finding by experience that it is an evil thing which deprives him of life, man may never attempt it at all; but knowing that what preserves his life, namely, obedience to God, is good, he may keep it with all diligence. Wherefore he has a twofold experience, possessing knowledge of both kinds, so that with training he can make choice of that which is better. But how could he be instructed in what is good unless he had knowledge of the contrary? For just as the tongue learns to distinguish bitter from sweet by the taste, and the eye learns by the sight to discriminate between black and white, so does the mind learn the difference between good and evil. But if any one shuns that experience of both good and evil, which

[1] v. 3. 1.

is, after all, the safeguard of the faith, he kills his manhood without knowing it[1]."

Irenaeus does not palliate evil, but endeavours to explain its meaning in the economy of life, and treats it as a moral education, as he treats suffering as a sanctifying discipline. He would brand the conduct of the man who flies from the world and its temptations as cowardice, and "the murder of human nature" (*latenter semetipsum occidit hominem*). "And how," he pertinently asks, "can one be God before he is man? How can he be perfect when recently made? How can he be immortal before he has obeyed his Maker in his mortal nature[2]?" "They are, therefore, unreasonable who do not await the time of increase, but impute to God their own infirmities, for they neither know themselves nor God, and are discontented and ungrateful, unwilling to be what they have been created, men subject to passions. But overleaping the law of the human race, before they are men, they aspire to be like God their Creator, as if there were no difference between the Uncreated God and the man He has made. For we blame Him because He did not make us Gods at the beginning, but men first and Gods afterwards. It was in His benevolence that God adopted this course, so that no one might impute to Him a jealous or grudging disposition. Of His goodness He gave man a free will like His own[3]. By reason of His foreknowledge He was aware of the results of human infirmity; but in His love and power He shall subdue the substance of the nature He created. For it was necessary that nature should be exhibited first, and afterwards that the mortal part should be

[1] IV. 39. 1. [2] IV. 39. 2.

[3] Similes sibi suae potestatis.

subdued and absorbed by the immortal, and finally that man should be made after the image and likeness of God, having received the knowledge of good and evil[1]."

Thus the presence of evil conduces to man's development and redounds to the glory of God, "Whose power is made perfect in weakness, so that we should not be puffed up with conceit, as if we had life in ourselves and of ourselves. But learning from experience that it is from His greatness and not of our own nature that we endure unto eternal life, we should neither fall short of His glory nor misunderstand our own nature, but knowing what God can do and what man receives, we should never fail to comprehend aright the relations of God and man. May it not be for this that God permitted our dissolution, that we, being educated in every way, with regard to the future might be carefully instructed in all things, fully realizing our own nature and the power of God[2]?" This teaching on human progress and the strenuous life is similarly expressed in Browning's *Rabbi Ben Ezra*:

> Grow old along with me!
> The best is yet to be,
> The last of life for which the first was made:
> Our times are in His hand
> Who saith, A whole I planned,
> Youth shows but half; trust God; nor be afraid.
> . . . . . .
> Then welcome each rebuff
> That turns earth's smoothness rough,
> Each sting that bids nor sit nor stand but go!
> Be our joy three-parts pain,
> Strive and hold cheap the strain;
> Learn, nor account the pang; dare, never grudge the throe!

The principle of development is extended to the human race at large in II. 24. 4, where we read: "The race of man passes through five ages, infancy, boyhood,

[1] IV. 38. 4. [2] V. 2. 3.

youth, manhood, and old age," and in v. 24. 1—2, he tells us that God has ordered the earthly life of man, appointing human rulers, establishing human authority, and "grounding the principle of fear in the hearts of men, so that, being kept down by the authority of man when they did not acknowledge the fear of God, they might attain to some degree of justice and mutual forbearance through fear of the sword of government. This earthly rule has therefore been appointed by God for the advantage of the nations, and not by the devil, who is never at rest himself and is loth to allow the nations to be so."

But the sentences in which Irenaeus describes man's daily progress in grace and ascension towards the perfect, that is, the Uncreated One, are shot with vital gold. We have already referred to the noble words of IV. 38. 3. In II. 28. 1 man's increase in the love of God; in II. 26. 1 man's approach to God by love; and in V. 3. 1 the increase of glory that follows the increase of love to be wrought out by the power of God in those who love Him, are depicted in glowing phrase.

In conclusion, God's ideal for man is reached by the help of the Divine guidance with the self-determination of man, and the active co-operation of the human will with the will Divine in things pertaining to its well-being, moral, social, and spiritual. For "a living man is the glory of God, but the vision of God is the life of man[1]." And while "God is the glory of man," the life of man is a sphere for the energy, wisdom, and power of God. For as the physician is proved by his patients, so is God manifested in the life of man[2]. And thus evil is removed from, and harmony restored in, the human existence. Man's deification has been made possible by

[1] IV. 20. 7. [2] III. 20. 2.

the Incarnation, from which instruction, strength, and incorruptibility have passed into the human race emancipated and exultant[1]. The practical application of these lessons which are taught by Irenaeus might not unfittingly be expressed in the verse of Henry Vaughan, the Anglican mystic of light:

> Then bless thy secret growth, nor catch
> At noise, but thrive unseen and dumb,
> Keep clean, bear fruit, earn life and watch
> Till the white-winged reapers come,

and in the prose of Benjamin Whichcote: "When the doctrine of the Gospel becomes the reason of our mind it will be the principle of our life[2]"; "Thou hast made us for Thyself, our souls are unsatisfied and are unquiet in us, there is emptiness till Thou dost communicate Thyself, till we return to Thee[3]"; and might be compared with the beautiful words of Origen on God's education of man—"God orders the career of the soul not for the matter of a fifty years' existence here, but for the unending life; for He has made the intellectual nature incorruptible and akin to Himself; nor shall the rational soul be cribbed, cabined, and uncultivated[4] as in this life[5]."

[1] III. 23. 2; IV. 24. 1.
[2] *Aphorisms.*
[3] *Sermons*, IV. 34, after Augustine.
[4] οὐκ ἀποκλείεται τῆς θεραπείας.
[5] *De Princ.* III. 13.

CHAPTER V

THE RULE OF FAITH

HAVING set forth the arguments with which Irenaeus met the Gnostics, we now turn to the constructive side of his work which had an important bearing upon the Christianity of his own and the succeeding age, and which was elicited by the assertions of his adversaries.

The passages in this treatise that express the rule of faith, the *regula fidei* or *veritatis*, are many and valuable. How far these creeds were interpreted and revived by the pen of Irenaeus we cannot tell, but we may rest assured that the creed he held was substantially the same as that which had been handed down from Apostolic times. It is very remarkable that a creed almost similar in sublime phrase and logical order to the splendid dogmatism of Nicaea and Constantinople might be reconstructed from his writings. More theological but less historical than the Western, it would be more historical and less theological than the Eastern creed. In this chapter shall be given a brief account of the growth of the creed, the principal rules of faith found in this treatise, and the creed as it might be built up from its pages.

It would seem that there were, in sub-apostolic times, a great number of kerugmata or formulae of faith in the

different communities, which, based upon the words of Scripture (i.e. the Baptismal formulae and the Pauline summaries of the Incarnation and its results), tended to become stereotyped and to repeat the same tenets in the same order. And when the Church began to extend its borders, in order to prevent its degeneration into a congeries of small and independent sects, the leaders of Christianity, the Apostles, prophets, and teachers, found it necessary to accentuate the unity of the Body by emphasizing the unity of the Faith. This work is ascribed by Bishop Wordsworth[1] to the charismatic and general ministry of the Church[2]. This interest was still further promoted by the aggressive policy of the heretics and schismatics who sprang from the very fold itself. Such was the origin of that creed, for example, which was formulated in Rome and to which Tertullian refers. "Let us see," said he[3], "what it (i.e. the Roman Church) has learned, what it has taught, and what fellowship it has with the African Churches. It acknowledges one God the Lord, the Creator of the Universe, and Jesus Christ, the Son of God, the Creator, born of the Virgin Mary, as well as the resurrection of the flesh. It unites the law and the prophets with the writings of the Evangelists and Apostles. From these it draws its faith, by their authority it seals this faith with water, clothes it with the Holy Spirit, and encourages martyrdom. Hence it receives no one who rejects this institution." A different form of creed, however, constituted the basis of Irenaeus' rules (*regulae*). It was an Eastern, or Greek creed, not a Latin or Roman, that he expressed in fixed formulae and "interpreted in an

[1] *Ministry of Grace*, p. 148.
[2] *Vide* Irenaeus, IV. 26. 5.
[3] *De Praes.* c. 36.

anti-heretical sense," to use Professor Harnack's phrase. But it is to be remembered that there is no doctrine put forward by Irenaeus which was, if not literally, at least in spirit and in truth professed by the Apostles and expressed or implied in the New Testament. Had this not been the case, his Gnostic opponents would soon have discovered the fallacy. But feeling the force of his argument, they did not meet it by an appeal to the public and well-known tradition of the Apostles, but to select and private information of which no one outside their select circle knew anything.

The Gnostics themselves had published rules of faith, as we learn from Iren. III. 11. 3, "if any one will study these *rules*, he will find that in all the Word of God, the Higher Christ, is represented as without flesh and the power of suffering." And controversy with Gnosticism must have taught the Church at a very early date the necessity of drawing up a concise statement of its faith, in order to secure her children against lapses into heresy. "For he," wrote Irenaeus, "who is loyal and steadfast to the *rule of truth which he received at his Baptism* will recognize the names and sayings and parables that have been taken from the Scripture, but will not accept their blasphemous theory. For he will place the words in their own context and unmask their unfounded inventions[1]." In this passage we have an important reference to a Baptismal rule of truth (*κανὼν τῆς ἀληθείας*) which was evidently equivalent to a summary of articles of the faith as distinguished from those of Gnosticism, and which was doubtless a development of the Baptismal formula[2]. In the next paragraph he declares that "the

[1] I. 9. 4.
[2] Tertullian (*De Cor. Milit.* 3), after describing the twice repeated—both

truth which is proclaimed (κηρυττομένην) by the Church is constant" (βεβαίαν). This, in short, is the doctrine preached by the Church[1] (*praeconium ecclesiae*=κήρυγμα), or the tradition (παράδοσις) which, as distinguished from the teaching of the Gnostics, is the apostolic tradition of the Church, which had been held continuously and without adulteration, and was handed down from the Apostles to the times of Irenaeus. Of this tradition the Churches of Rome, Smyrna, and Ephesus are witnesses[2]. "And that ancient apostolic tradition" is our guide in all controversial matters[3]. Hegesippus[4] also appeals to the uniformity of the teaching and constitution of the Church and to its loyalty to the preaching of the law, the prophets, and the Lord.

As distinguished from the heretics, the Catholic Church allows no tampering with doctrine, no secret teaching—this perhaps is the most important point on which the Church differed from the Gnostic sects—and no innovations. For "they who abandon the teaching of the Church cast a slur upon the experience of the holy presbyters[5]." "For if the Apostles had been cognisant of any hidden mysteries, and had been in the habit of imparting such to the perfect, they had surely delivered them to those to whom they were entrusting the Churches. For they desired above all things that the men to whom they handed over their place of government (*magisterii locum*—which Bishop Wordsworth identifies with the Bishop's seat, 'the place of teaching'[6]) should be perfect and blameless in every

in Church and at the water—renunciation of the devil, his pomp and angels, says: "We are thrice immersed, after making a somewhat longer response than the Lord appointed in the Gospel."

[1] v. 20. 2. [2] Iren. III. 3. 3 and 4. [3] III. 4. 1.
[4] Euseb. *H. E.* IV. 21. [5] v. 20. 2. [6] op. cit. p. 164.

respect[1]." "Accordingly, it is our duty to avoid these 'thieves and robbers,' to cling with all diligence to the things of the Church, and to grasp the tradition of the truth[2]." "The Apostles simply and openly taught every thing that had been revealed to them and without grudging to every man[3]." After quoting the hymn of the Church[4], Irenaeus says: "These are the words of the Church[5], from which every Church doth take its rise; these are the words of the metropolis of the citizens of the New Testament; these are the words of the Apostles; these are the words of the disciples of our Lord, of those who were truly perfect, being perfected by the Spirit after their Lord's assumption, and who invoked the God Who made heaven and earth and the sea, and was announced by the prophets and His Son Jesus Whom God anointed, not knowing any other God. For neither Valentinus nor Marcion nor others, who made havoc of those who gave them their confidence, had as yet appeared upon the scene."

The following are the principal summaries of the apostolic faith that are found in this treatise:

"The Church, although scattered over the face of the earth, received from the Apostles and their disciples the faith in One God, the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth, the seas and all that in them is, and in One Christ Jesus the Son of God, Who became incarnate for our salvation, and in the Holy Ghost, Who by the prophets proclaimed the dispensations and the advents, and the Virgin-birth, and the passion and the resurrection[6] from the dead, and the bodily ascension of

[1] III. 3. 1. [2] III. 4. 1. [3] III. 14. 2. [4] Acts iv. 24; III. 12. 5.

[5] The Church at Jerusalem. Irenaeus or his translator inserted the words *Tota Ecclesia* in the 24th verse of Acts iv.

[6] The "descent into hell," "descendit ad inferna" or "ad inferos" clause

the well-beloved Christ Jesus our Lord into heaven, and His Parousia from the heavens in the glory of the Father to gather up all things in Himself and to raise the flesh of all mankind to life, in order that every thing in heaven and in earth and under the earth should bow to Christ Jesus our Lord and God, our Saviour and our King, according to the Will of the invisible Father, and that every tongue should confess to Him, and that He should pronounce judgment upon all, and dismiss spiritual wickedness, and the angels who transgressed and became apostate along with the ungodly, unrighteous and profane, into everlasting fire, but in His graciousness should confer life and the reward of incorruption and eternal glory upon those who have kept His commandments and abided in His love, either from the beginning of their life or since their repentance[1]."

"This kerugma and this faith," he declares, "the Church, although scattered over the whole world, diligently observes as if it occupied but one house, and believes as if it had but one mind, and preaches and teaches as if it had but one mouth. And although there are many dialects in the world, the meaning of the tradition is one and the same. For the same faith is held by the Churches in Germany, in Spain, among the Celtic tribes, in the East, in Egypt, in Libya, and in the central portions of the world. But as the sun, the natural light, is one and the same, so is the light of the kerugma of the truth which shines on all who desire to come to the knowledge of the truth[2]." "The

did not appear until much later. Rufinus expressly denied that this clause was in the Roman or the Eastern creeds. It was first used in Aquileia.

[1] I. 10. 1. [2] I. 10. 2.

faith of the Church is therefore one. In exposition there is a certain latitude; but in fundamentals there is unity."

"Herein lies," he remarks, "the difference between the Gnostic and the Church teachers. For while the former have assumed another God, another Christ, or another Only-Begotten, the latter are loyal to the subject-matter of the faith. They have not conceived any other God besides Him Who is the Framer, Maker, and Preserver of the Universe, or another Christ, or another Only-Begotten. They may throw light upon the obscurities of the parables and point out their application to the scheme of faith, they may explain the operation and dispensation of God for man's salvation, and His long-suffering in the apostacy of the angels, and in regard to the disobedience of man; they may show why God made some things temporal and other things eternal, these heavenly and those earthly; they may suggest reasons why God, although invisible, manifested Himself in different ways to different people; they may say why there has been more than one covenant for man and what is the character of each; why God concluded all in unbelief; why God became Man and endured the Passion; and why the Parousia of the Son of God took place in these last times, that is, at the end instead of at the beginning; they may also unfold all that the Scriptures contain regarding the end of the world and the things to come; and they need not be silent as to why it is that God hath made the Gentiles, whose salvation was beyond hope, fellow-heirs, members of the same body, and of the fellowship of the Saints; they may expound in their discourses the meaning of the words, "This mortal body shall put on immortality, and this

corruptible shall put on incorruption[1]," and they may proclaim in what sense He says, "That is a people which was not a people, and she is beloved who was not beloved[2]." Such study, he argues, would indeed edify the student more than the absurd theories and theosophy of the Gnostics, which reveal not only the blasphemy, but also the dissensions of the heretics on questions fundamental to their belief. For few as they are they do not agree among themselves in their treatment of the same points, but in regard to the things they describe and the names they employ, are at variance with one another. "Whereas the whole Church throughout the world possesses one and the same faith."

The following interesting rule of faith is found in I. 22. 1:—

"The rule of truth (*regula veritatis*) we hold is, that there is One God Almighty, Who made all things by His Word, and fashioned and formed that which has existence out of that which had none. As the Scripture saith, 'By the Word of the Lord and the Spirit of His Mouth were the heavens and all their glory established.' And again, 'All things were made by Him and without Him was nothing made.' There is no exception; but the Father made all things by Him, both visible and invisible, objects of sense and intelligence, temporal, eternal and everlasting. And such He did not make by angels or by any powers separated from His Thought. For God needs nought of such things; but He it is Who by His Word and Spirit makes, disposes, governs, and gives being to all things, Who created the universe, Who is the

[1] Irenaeus quotes evidently from memory the words of St Paul in 1 Cor. xv. 54, reversing the order of the clause and adding *σαρκίον*, which is not in any Greek MS.

[2] I. 10. 3.

God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. Above Him there is no other God, neither initial principle, nor power, nor pleroma. He is the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. Holding this rule, we shall easily show that the heretics, in spite of their many and various assertions, have deviated from the truth."

A noble hymn-like utterance on the Father and the Son is found in II. 30. 9:—

"But there is one only God, the Creator. He is above every principality and power and dominion and virtue. He is Father. He is God. He is Founder and Maker and Builder. He made all these things, the heavens, the earth, the seas and all that therein is, by Himself, that is, by His Word and His Wisdom. He formed man, He planted Paradise, He made the world, He sent the flood, He saved Noah, He is the God of the living; Whom the law proclaims, the prophets preach, and Christ reveals; Whom the Apostles announce and in Whom the Church believes. He is the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, through His Word, who is His Son; through Him He is revealed and manifested to all to whom He is made known; for they only know Him to whom the Son reveals Him. But the Son always existing with the Father from of old, yea, from the beginning, ever revealeth the Father to Angels, Archangels, Powers, and Virtues, and to whomsoever He pleaseth."

A fuller creed of the Incarnation is found in the third book. Speaking of the apostolic tradition of truth, which he says has been entrusted to the keeping of the Church, he writes[1]:—

"To this rule many nations of the barbarians, having

[1] III. 4. 2.

salvation written on their heart by the Spirit, without the assistance of paper or ink, consent, steadfastly adhering to the ancient tradition, believing in One God, the Maker of earth and heaven, and of all things therein, by Christ Jesus the Son of God, Who on account of His great love for His creation condescended to be born of a Virgin, and through Himself uniting man and God, suffered under Pontius Pilate, and rising again and having been received in splendour, shall come again in glory as the Saviour of those who are saved, and the Judge of those who are judged, to send to eternal fire those who alter the truth and despise His Father and His advent. Those who have held this faith handed down to them by word of mouth (*sine literis*) may be barbarians, as far as language is concerned, but as regards doctrine, manner, and tenor of life are wise because of their faith; and are well pleasing to God, walking in holiness and chastity and wisdom. But if anyone should speak to them in their own tongue about the inventions of the heretics, they would shut their ears and hasten away, because they will not listen to any blasphemous utterance. Thanks to that ancient apostolic tradition, they do not allow their mind to foster for a moment any of their false doctrines. For as yet there was nothing known of a heretical congregation or creed among them."

When he sums up his polemic against the Gnostics in the second book, he makes this important allusion to an oral tradition:—

"With our words the preaching (*praedicatio*) of the Apostles, the master-teaching of the Lord, the announcement of the prophets, the dictated utterances (*dictatio*) of the Apostles, and the ministry of the law are in

agreement. For all these praise one and the same God and Father of all, not different Gods, nor one deriving His substance from diverse deities, or powers; but they declare that all things were made by one and the same Father, who adapts His method to the nature and form of His material, and that things, visible and invisible, were created neither by angels nor by any Virtue, but by God the Father alone[1]."

Such a creed, he declares, was handed down from the Apostle John. "For John, the disciple of our Lord, wishing to put an end to all such ideas (i.e. the doctrines of Cerinthus concerning the Word and of the Gnostics concerning God) and to establish in the Church the rule of truth (*regula veritatis*) that there is One God Almighty, Who made all things by His Word, things visible and invisible; and also showing that by the Word, through Whom God made the creation, He also bestowed salvation on those who belong to the creation, thus began His teaching in the Gospel: 'In the beginning was the Word[2].'"

This tradition is more closely identified with the Trinitarian creed, which is clearly an expansion of the Baptismal formula, in the fourth book[3]. Speaking of the spiritual disciple there, Irenaeus says:—

"He has a sound faith in One God Almighty, of Whom all things are, and in the Son of God, Jesus Christ our Lord, by Whom are all things, and in His Economy, by which the Son of God became man; and has also a firm faith in the Spirit of God, Who gives us the knowledge of the truth, Who has expounded the dispensation of the Father and the Son, by which He dwells in every generation according to His Father's Will. And this

[1] II. 35. 4. [2] III. 11. 1. [3] IV. 33. 7.

tradition has been received by the Church which has come down to us from the Apostles. This tradition neither suffers addition nor curtailment; it is based upon the true reading of Scripture; is a lawful and careful exposition of the faith in harmony with the Scriptures and is the true gnosis, the teaching of the Apostles, and the ancient system of the Church throughout the world."

Such are, perhaps, the earliest recorded summaries of the rule of faith which Irenaeus learnt from his teachers, Justin, Ignatius, and others, and which he is careful to inform his readers is based upon Scripture and apostolic tradition. Reading such statements with the additional light of the different passages in the treatise that explain and interpret them, we find they bear a closer resemblance to the present form of the Nicene than to the Apostles' Creed. Irenaeus, for example, emphasizes the Unity of the Father and the Unity of the Son. The Father is the Maker of all things *visible and invisible by His Word, the Only-Begotten.* Jesus is *Verus Deus*—Very God. He is begotten of the Father. He became incarnate *for our salvation,* and He will return with glory to judge all men. And the Holy Spirit (*qui vivificat hominem*) is the Giver of Life[1]; who expounds the dispensations of the Father and the Son[2].

Irenaeus also emphasizes the catholic[3] and the apostolic character[4] of the Church, and the connection of Baptism with remission of sins[5]. It is also remarkable that the word *Homoousion,* which makes its appearance after many adventures in the Nicene Creed, is to be found in The description of the Theory of Emanations

[1] v. 9. 1. [2] iv. 33. 7. [3] iii. 11. 8.
[4] v. 20. 1. [5] i. 21. 2.

in II. 17. 2 (*ejusdem substantiae*). The expression, *a lumine lumina*, lights from light, may also have suggested the Nicene phrase, "light of light" (φῶς ἐκ φωτός). These features are distinctly Eastern and Nicene; and have a special interest for Irish Churchmen, as they have left their impress on the Creed which St Patrick gives in his Confession[1], the oldest summary of faith of the Celtic Church. This will be more fully discussed in another place.

[1] c. 4.

CHAPTER VI

THE OMNIPOTENT FATHER

In the preceding chapter we have seen something of the history of the Christian Creed, as it grew in definiteness and content, like a noble flower developing its latent possibilities while wrestling for existence with its environment of heresy and unbelief. In this, we shall endeavour to show how this wonderful bloom of faithful Christendom sprang from one noble stem—the belief in the One Omnipotent Father—the parent truth of all theology, following our author's example, for he said: "It is fitting that I should commence with the first and most important subject, God the Creator Who made heaven and earth, but Whom these blasphemers describe as the fruit of a defect, and that I should demonstrate that there is nothing above or after Him, and that influenced by none, but of His own free will, He created all things, since He is the only Creator and the only Father, Who alone contains all things and causes all things to exist[1]." Commencing with this subject, we shall collect the principal passages that illustrate Irenaeus' treatment of it. The keynote of his theology is found in these words: "By the Word of the Lord the heavens were established," and again: "All things were made

[1] II. I. I.

by Him and without Him was nothing made." "There is no exception or deduction to be made, but the Father made all things by Him, things visible and invisible, objects of sense or of intellectual knowledge, temporal and eternal[1]." The Father is thus the One efficient cause of all things. He is also the substantial cause. "Whereas the heretics seek to explain the substance of matter and to trace its history from the tears and smiles, the terror and sadness of Achamoth, it is more credible and rational to attribute the substance of created things to the power and will of Him Who is Lord of all[2]." Again, we read in II. 10. 4: "In this point God showed His superiority to man, that while man cannot make anything out of nothing, but only out of matter already existing, yet He Himself called into existence the substance of His creation, although previously it had no existence." Content that God made us, we should not ask how He did the deed: "For we shall not go far astray if we assert the same thing about the substance of matter, namely, that God produced it. For the Scriptures teach us that God has the supremacy over all things. But whence or in what manner He produced it, Scripture has not declared. It is therefore not becoming in us to make endless guesses and conjectures on this subject. We should rather leave such knowledge in the hands of God Himself[3]."

Moreover, God is always the same, and man develops by growing towards Him[4]. "In this respect God differs from man, that whereas man is made, God makes. And, indeed, He Who makes is always the same, but that which is made must receive beginning and middle,

[1] I. 22. 1.
[2] II. 10. 3.
[3] II. 28. 7.
[4] IV. 11. 2.

addition and increase. And God is the benefactor, while man obtains the benefit. God also is perfect in all things, being equal and like to Himself, for He is all light and all mind and all substance, and the source of all that is good; whereas man makes progress and advances towards God. For as God is ever the same, man, when found in God, shall ever grow towards Him. God never ceases to enrich and to confer benefits upon man, while man never ceases to receive these benefits and to be enriched by God."

The perfections of the Creator are extolled in IV. 38. 3, where we read: "God is the Uncreated One[1], and therefore He hath the pre-eminence in all things. He only is uncreated, the first of all things and the primary cause of the existence of all, whereas everything else is in subjection to Him. But subjection to God is immortality, and immortality is the glory of the Uncreated[2]. For the Uncreated is perfect and He is God." And in a beautiful passage[3] he describes the gifts of God to man: "In the beginning God formed Adam, not because He stood in need of man, but in order that He might have beings upon whom He might confer benefits. Nor did He require our service when He bade us follow Him, but for this cause He bestowed salvation upon us. For to follow the Saviour is to partake of salvation, and to walk in the light is to receive light. They who are in the light do not themselves give the light, but are enlightened and illumined by it. And so service rendered to God profits Him nought, but He confers upon those

[1] ὁ καὶ μόνος ἀγέννητος: cf. Patrick *Confessio* 4, non est alius Deus... praeter Deum Patrem *ingenitum*.

[2] Reading δόξα ἀγεννήτου or ἀγενήτου (for ἀγέννητος) to correspond with the Latin "gloria infecti."

[3] IV. 14. 1.

who follow Him life and incorruption and eternal glory. For He is rich, perfect, and in need of nought. *But man needs communion with Him*[1]." Furthermore, the Creator alone is without beginning[2]. "For He is Himself uncreated, without beginning or end, and lacks nothing, but is self-sufficient. Moreover, He grants to others the very existence they have. The things, however, which have been so made by Him have a beginning. But whatever has had a beginning is liable to dissolution, and is subject to and in need of Him Who made it, and, therefore, must be differently named even by those who have but a moderate discernment. For He alone, Who made all things, may together with His Word properly be called God and Lord. Therefore, the things which have been made have no right to this name, seeing that it belongs to the Creator."

And again, when writing on the immortality of the soul, he says: "Let them learn that God alone, Who is Lord of all, is without beginning and without end, and is always and ever the same unchangeable Being. But all things that come from Him, and are made by Him, receive a beginning of existence and are inferior to Him Who formed them, because they are not unbegotten[3]."

Upon the stock question of the ancient Church "Why could not man have been made perfect?" Irenaeus makes this comment[4]: "If any should ask: 'What, could not God have made man perfect from the beginning?' let him learn that to God, inasmuch as He is always the same and unbegotten, as regards Himself, all things are possible. But created things must be

[1] Homo indiget Dei communione. This thought is developed in St Augustine's *Confessions* I. 1, fecisti nos ad te et inquietum est cor nostrum donec requiescat in te. Cf. X. 6 et seq.

[2] III. 8. 3. [3] II. 34. 2. [4] IV. 38. 1.

inferior to Him Who made them because of their later origin; for it was not possible for things recently created to be uncreated, and therefore they fall short of perfection."

There is thus scope for development or evolution. But it is a God-directed development; as he writes[1]: "Wherefore Plato is more pious than Marcion and his followers, because he admitted that the same God was both just and good, having power over all things, and executing judgement Himself, and thus expressed it: 'And God, as He is the ancient Word and possesses the beginning, the middle, and the end of all existence, does everything rightly, moving round in the way of nature, while justice, the avenger of the Divine law, follows Him.' And again, he pointed out that the Maker and Framer of the universe is good, saying "the good never feel envy[2]" and maintaining that "the goodness of God, not ignorance, nor an erring aeon, nor the fruit of a defect, nor a weeping mother, nor another God or Father, is the original cause of the creation of the world[3]."

While the heretics are inferior to Plato, they take their stand with the degenerate Epicureans. For, "like the Epicureans, they invent a God who does nothing either for himself or others, and so exercises no providence at all[4]," and "while professing that Jesus is their Master,

[1] III. 25. 5.

[2] Timaeus p. 29, *ἀγαθὸς ἦν, ἀγαθῷ δὲ οὐδεὶς περὶ οὐδενὸς οὐδέποτε ἐγγίγνεται φθόνος.*

[3] Origen also recognizes the truth of a Platonic saying, when arguing with a Gentile philosopher, quoting the words: "It is a hard matter to find out the Maker and Founder of the Universe, and it is beyond the power of him who has found Him to declare Him to all men," adding his own correction—"without the aid of Him Who is sought."—*C. Cels.* VII. 9.

[4] III. 24. 2.

they emulate the philosophy of Epicurus and the indifferentism of the cynics[1]."

Having thus described the Creator as Father, the Perfect One, the Cause of the Creation, without beginning or end, omnipotent and invariable, he now proceeds to discuss certain problems connected with the Divine Existence. The first of these concerns the relation of the foreknowledge to the predestinating will of God. In II. 2. 4 he says: "But He Himself in Himself, in a manner that we cannot either describe or imagine, predestinating all things, formed them as He pleased, and gave to them all the harmony and order they possess." Thus Irenaeus recognized the fact that everything proceeds from the Will of God. "That will and energy of God," he said in a sermon "On Faith," of which a fragment is cited by Maximus of Turin[2], "is the efficient and foreseeing cause of every time, place, age, and nature." That Will of God is further described in another fragment given by Massuet: "Seeing that God," he wrote, "is vast, and the Architect of the world and Almighty, He made it by a Will, vast, creative of all things and omnipotent, potentially and actually, with the novel result that the entire fulness of the things which have been produced might come into existence although they had as yet no existence." "This Will of God," he declares, "is dominant and must rule all things which are in subjection to Him[3]." In the words of Dante,

> The Will Divine is man's tranquillity,
> It is the sea to which creation moves[4].

In another place[5] he writes: "With God there is nothing done without purpose and meaning." In II. 5. 4 he

[1] II. 32. 2. [2] See Harvey II. 477. [3] II. 34. 4.
[4] *Paradiso*, Canto XI. 1. [5] IV. 21. 3.

declares that the Will of God is supreme and completely independent of any external necessity, and thus He differs from the Homeric Zeus, who was compelled to act against his will. And in II. 29. 2 he says that "God has the will to do kindness, because He is good, and the ability to perform, because He is all-powerful."

The Will of God is, therefore, creative, almighty, purposeful, supreme, beneficent, and independent. But how is this independent will related to the foreknowledge of God? This was the problem with which Irenaeus was compelled to grapple. For the Marcionites sought to demonstrate that the God of the Old Testament was the author of sin, because He is represented as having, morally speaking, blinded Pharaoh and his servants. In this difficulty Irenaeus followed the lead of that apostle who based the predestination of God upon His foreknowledge, in the sentence "whom He did foreknow, He also did predestinate[1]"—a text, however, which is not cited by Irenaeus—as he was followed, in his turn, by Augustine, who declared "there can be no predestination without foreknowledge, but there may be foreknowledge without predestination[2]." In IV. 29. 2 he wrote: "If even now God, Who foreknows all things and is aware how many will not believe in Him, has handed them over to their unbelief and turned His face away from such, leaving them in self-chosen darkness, what wonder is it if He then surrendered Pharaoh, who never would have believed, and his people to their unbelief?" See also II. 28. 7 where he says in effect: "We must leave the cause of man's revolt and sin to God, and not investigate the origin of evil, which God, indeed, foreknew would

[1] Rom. viii. 29. [2] *De Orth. Fide* III. 30.

come, and for which He prepared punishment." And in V. 1. 1 he writes: "We were therefore predestinated according to the foreknowledge of the Father, we, who as yet were not, to be, and were made the firstfruits of His workmanship."

Irenaeus maintained in his argument the integrity of the human freedom of will. In conclusion, he bids us depend upon the Will of God, which is not the author of evil but of everything that is good, is directed by internal love, not by external necessity, and is aware of our condition and has made wise provision for our wants. But we must not resist it like the Egyptians, whose hardening of heart was the result of their own self-will, nor question the omnipotence and omniscience of the Maker.

Another problem that exercised the mind and pen of Irenaeus was the relation of the justice to the goodness of God. Marcion, of Sinope, it will be remembered, was perplexed by the apparent contradictions which he discovered in the scriptural character of the Divine, and could devise no other method of reconciling love with grace, forgiveness with justice, and the God of the Old Testament with the God of the New, than by imagining two Gods, the God of Judaism, merciless and judicial, and the Father of Jesus, merciful and benign. In his argument with Marcion[1], Irenaeus declared that he had put an end to Deity by thus dividing God into two—"for the judicial God, if He has not the goodness which is the characteristic of Deity, is not God, because he is no God in whom goodness is wanting; and, on the other hand, if He is good, but lacking in judicial authority,

[1] III. 25. 3.

He has not the stamp of Divinity. The love and justice of God cannot, then, be separated; He is Lord and Judge and Ruler of all. He is good and patient and merciful, and saves whom it is right to save (*salvat quos oportet*). His goodness fails Him not, being used in justice, and His wisdom is never diminished. He is, therefore, both just and good, His mercy preventing and taking precedence of His justice (*neque justum immite ostenditur, praeeunte scilicet et praecedente bonitate*)." In these words, that are reset in the golden verse of Shakspeare:

> And earthly power doth then show likest God's
> When mercy seasons justice,

Irenaeus declares the co-existence of these eternal principles, love and justice, in the bosom of God. "For justice demands judgement, but judgement doth wait upon wisdom. And in wisdom the Father excels."

While His power and authority are most exalted and supreme[1], God is represented as the one entire source of all that is good[2]. As He remains unchanged, His goodness to man never ceases[3]. "It is, indeed, proper to God and becoming His character to show mercy and pity, and to bring salvation to His creatures. For with Him there is propitiation[4]." Again he writes: "For this cause God demands service from us men, that good and merciful as He is, He may help those who abide in His service[5]." In the fifth and second books[6] we have these epigrammatic sentences: "This Creator is He Who is the Father by reason of His love, the Lord by reason of His power, and the Maker by reason of His wisdom." "His riches are unbounded, infinite is His kingdom, and His instruction is inexhaustible." "With God," he says,

[1] II. 6. 1. [2] I. 12. 2. [3] IV. 11. 2.
[4] Fragment. [5] IV. 14. 1. [6] V. 17. 1, II. 28. 3.

"there are exhibited, at one and the same time, power, wisdom, and goodness. His goodness and power appear in this, that He, of His own will, called into being things that had no previous existence; while His wisdom is manifested in His having made all things parts of one uniform whole[1]." A favourite attribute of God with Irenaeus is "rich." By this he meant resourceful. "God," he says, "is powerful and rich in all things[2]." "He has the power of performing His wishes because He is rich" (εὔπορος)[3]. Origen goes a step further than Irenaeus in identifying goodness and justice as virtues[4].

Irenaeus would, accordingly, sum up his case very differently from Marcion, who declared[5] that the God of the Old Testament is "neither good, nor prescient, nor almighty."

Other leading questions, such as "What was God doing before He made the world[6]?" and "What is the origin of matter[7]?" he bids us leave upon the knees of God, for Scripture has revealed nothing to us on these subjects. But he advised those who speak disparagingly of the creation to study the harmonies of the universe, and to observe the oneness of purpose and oneness of result manifested by the creation of Him "Who has stamped His mind upon His work." "Let them, then, cease from saying that the world was made by another. For it was not possible for one to conceive and another to construct what had its conception in the Divine mind. As it has been made exactly as it was planned by Him, it must be worthy of Him. But to say with the heretics that what was mentally conceived and so designed as it was

[1] IV. 38. 3.
[2] II. 10. 3.
[3] II. 29. 2.
[4] *De Princ.* II. 5.
[5] See Tertullian, *Adv. Mar.* II. 5.
[6] II. 28. 3.
[7] II. 28. 7.

made by the Father is the result of defect or the product of ignorance were arrant blasphemy[1]." "Many and various, no doubt, are the different parts of the creation. These may seem, when considered separately, to be contrary and opposite to one another, but when taken in connection with the rest of creation, they form one perfect whole, just as the many discordant notes of the lyre make one unbroken melody[2]." "Nothing that has been made escapes the cognizance of God. And every part of His work, no matter how small and insignificant it may be relatively to the whole, has received its special nature and rank, number and quantity from the transcendent wisdom and Divine intellect of the Maker[3]."

Of this consonance of creation in which discords are resolved into concords and casual pieces are wedded to their corresponding parts, the Creator Himself is the source. For "it is He Who distributes to everything the harmony, order and beginning of their creation, a spiritual and invisible order to the spiritual, a celestial to the celestial, an angelic to the angelic, a psychical to the psychical, and an earthly to the earthly, giving to each its proper substance[4]."

Origen's teaching is not unlike. It is to the effect that we can only see a fragment of a great system in which we merely follow the tendencies and signs. While universal being is "one thought" corresponding to the perfect will of God, "we that are not the whole, as parts can see but parts—now this, now that[5]."

Irenaeus warns us not to look for absolute perfection in the creation, nor to reason from the comparative imperfections of this world and its phenomena to the

[1] II. 3. 2. [2] II. 25. 2. [3] II. 26. 3, in substance.
[4] II. 2. 4. [5] *De Princ.* II. 5. 9. 5.

imperfection of its Maker, as the Gnostics did. For "there is," he writes, "a fundamental difference between the Maker and His work. For as He Who is uncreated has no beginning, is independent, and eternal, that which is created has a beginning, is dependent and transitory. It needs Him, and He does not require it[1]."

The conclusion the candid reader would draw from the teaching of Irenaeus is this, that it is our ignorance and limited knowledge that have created these apparent contradictions in the nature of things and the character of the Creator. These things are, after all, subjective, that is, they exist in the mind of the observer; whereas the goodness, wisdom and power of the Maker are objective, that is, they are manifested in the world around him. Origen likewise maintained the absolute causality of God, the super-essential essence to which he, like Irenaeus, attributed self-consciousness and will, but he went further than the Bishop of Lyons in attributing a certain limitation to the omniscience and omnipotence of God which seemed to exist in the nature of the case. But the limitation to His omnipotence, which the Gnostics ascribed to something external to God Himself, was placed by Origen in the Divine essence itself. God limits Himself to reveal Himself to man; to be understood by man[2], and to realize His will[3] in nature and humanity. Such limitation is, therefore, relative, not absolute[4].

Irenaeus would thus turn us from questions of ambitious speculation to the real problems of practical

[1] III. 8. 3, in substance.

[2] Περὶ ἀρχῶν II. 9. 1, ubi finis non est, nec comprehensio ulla. Naturaliter nempe quicquid infinitum fuerit, et incomprehensibile erit.

[3] *C. Cels.* V. 23.

[4] According to Origen a perfect knowledge of God can only be derived from the Logos (*C. Cels.* VII. 48, also Clement, *Strom.* V. 12. 85) but a relative knowledge may be obtained from the creation (*C. Cels.* VII. 46).

life, which alone are profitable, and advise us to accept intellectual difficulties as a discipline of faith and patience. Holding firm the belief in the super-personal unity, the infinite power, the inconceivable wisdom and the eternal nature of the Creator, he helps us to say with Tennyson

> Hallowed be Thy Name—Hallelujah!
> Infinite Ideality!
> Immeasurable Reality!
> Infinite Personality!
> Hallowed be Thy Name—Hallelujah!

Such being Irenaeus' views of God it may be profitable to follow for a brief space his method of confuting the Gnostic ideas of God by arguments drawn from Scripture, nature and reason. He chiefly sought to approach the subject from the standpoint of his adversaries and often succeeded in turning the point of their own statements against themselves.

In this controversy he, as well as other Church writers, followed the line of proving that the Demiurge, or Creator, must be the Supreme God, rather than that of showing that the Supreme God was the Demiurge, or Creator. In the following argument *ad hominem*, he challenges those who style Him the "fruit of a defect" to show their superiority to Him, on the principle that the better man is proved not by words but by works. "What work of theirs, wrought by their 'Saviour,' or their 'Mother'," he asks, "can they indicate as evincing greater power, or glory, or intelligence, than the works of Him Who has arranged all these things? What heavens have they made fast? What earth have they established? What stars have they sent forth? What constellations have they caused to shine? What rivers have they made to flow and what springs to well forth? With what flowers and trees have they adorned the earth, or what

multitude of beautiful animals, rational and irrational, have they created? Who can enumerate all the other things which have been established by the power and controlled by the wisdom of God? What shall I say of those existences which are beyond the heavens, and which do not pass away? To what similar achievement of their own hands can they, who are the workmanship of God, point us[1]?"

Irenaeus also wrote upon the thesis[2] that an absolutely necessary being exists as the cause of the world. "For if the Creator did not fashion these things Himself, but, as a builder of no ability or a boy learning his first lesson, copied them from other originals, where did Bythos obtain the plan of that creation which he first emitted? He must have got the design from some one superior to himself, and that one again from another, and so on *ad infinitum*. We have thus an endless series of causes unless we settle on one God, Who of Himself formed the things which are created. We allow that men can design useful things, why not admit that the God Who formed the world drew the plan and arranged the parts Himself[3]?"

Having thus reasoned from man up to God, he proceeds to reason from "the sacred economy of nature" to the Creator. "It is certain that the Creator is God. Even those who deny Him allow this. On another occasion I shall show that the Scriptures and the Master teach us of no other Father. For the present, the testimony which is given by those who differ from

[1] II. 30. 3.

[2] The antithesis of this thesis, in Kant's *Antinomies of Cosmology*, is: "Neither in this world nor without the world does there exist any absolutely necessary being as its cause."

[3] II. 7. 5.

us must suffice. For all men are agreed upon this one truth, and the ancients have carefully preserved it from the tradition of the protoplast, and celebrate in their hymns the One God, the Maker of heaven and earth. Some have been reminded of this fact by the prophets of God, while the very heathen have learned it from the creation itself. For even the creation reveals Him Who formed it, and the very fashion of it suggests Him Who made it, and the world manifests the mind of Him Who designed it[1]." "The existence of this God having been thus acknowledged on all sides, and testified to by all men, that Father whom they have invented is undoubtedly non-existent and without witness[2]." Even the heathen admit the providence of God. "For God exercises a providence over all things, and imparts counsel to all, being present to all who acquiesce in His moral discipline. It follows, then, as a matter of course, that the subjects of His vigilance and government should be acquainted with their Ruler, seeing that they are not devoid of reason, but have been endowed with intelligence through His forethought. And so certain of the Gentiles, less addicted than the rest to idolatry and licentiousness, were moved by His providence, slightly, indeed, but sufficiently to be convinced that they should call the Maker of this Universe 'the Father Who cares for all men and regulates the affairs of this our world[3].'" Compare Tertullian's words on "the testimony of a soul naturally Christian," in the *Apologeticus* and the *De Testimonio Animae.*

To this Creator, the Spirit, the Master and the Scriptures bear testimony. "For no other God and Lord was proclaimed by the Spirit save Him Who as

[1] II. 9. 1, Ethnicis vero ab ipsâ conditione discentibus.
[2] II. 9. 2.
[3] III. 25. 1.

God, with His Word, rules over all things. No other is acknowledged by those who have received the spirit of adoption, that is, who believe in one true God and in Christ Jesus, the Son of God. No other was called God or Lord by the apostles. No other was confessed by our Lord Himself, Who bade us call no one Father but Him Who dwelleth in the heavens, Who is the one God and the one Father[1]." "For is it not clear to all that if our Lord had known many Fathers and Gods, He would not have taught His disciples to know one God and to call Him alone Father? And if He is wrong, He is responsible for the mistake of His people[2]." Again he writes: "The Biblical names for God, such as Elohim, Adonai, Sabaoth, are not names of different Gods, but express different manifestations of one God and Father, Who contains all things and gives existence to all things[3]."

Having shown how the Gnostic position on the relation of the Father to the Creator is opposed to revelation, and nature itself, he proceeds to demonstrate that it is also contrary to logic. "They who maintain that their Father merely extends to the verge of that which is external to the Pleroma, and that the Demiurge, on the other hand, does not reach so far as the Pleroma, represent neither as perfect and comprehensive. For the former will be deficient in respect to the world that has been created outside the Pleroma, while the latter will be deficient touching the ideal world which was formed within the Pleroma; and so neither of them can be God of all. For the greatness of God must be complete and all-embracing[4]." The supreme God of the Gnostics lacks absolute dominion, seeing that they

[1] IV. 1. 1. [2] IV. 1. 2. [3] II. 35. 3.
[4] IV. 19. 3.

speak of a *kenoma*, or a void space, by which His power is bounded, and in which another God holds sway. Accordingly, the supreme God is limited, and as that which limits must be greater than that which it limits, the other power by whose province he is circumscribed must be the real God[1]. "And so the name of omnipotent will be reduced to an absurdity, impious as such an opinion may seem[2]." With regard to the assertion that the world was made in opposition to the will of the Supreme Father by angels, such inability in the Supreme One would expose Him to the charge of weakness and carelessness, he argues, as He would seem to lack either the necessary power, knowledge, or vigilance[3]. But if the world was made with His consent by other powers, no matter how many or how distant from Him, He would still be, in the very last resort, the author of the creation, just as the king who made the preparations for the battle has the credit of the victory[4]. "We have been taught by the Incarnate Word," he says, "to worship God after a new manner and not a new God[5]." "Well said Justin in his writings against Marcion 'I would not have believed the Lord Himself if He announced any other God than the Creator[6]'."

In this way Irenaeus proved from their own statements that the Supreme God of the Gnostics was lacking in those attributes of omnipotence, omniscience and absolute causality which, as he showed, are implied in the true conception of God.

[1] II. 1. 2. [2] II. 1. 5. [3] II. 2. 1.
[4] II. 2. 3. [5] III. 10. 2. [6] IV. 6. 2.

CHAPTER VII

MAN'S KNOWLEDGE OF GOD

GOD the Father is omniscient, but man's knowledge is limited. "It were presumption to assert that we are acquainted with the unspeakable mysteries[1] of God. Even our Lord declared that the day and hour of judgement were not known to Him. And if He the Son was not ashamed to ascribe the knowledge of that day to the Father, why should we be ashamed to leave with Him the great questions that perplex us[2]?"

Irenaeus warns us frequently against the danger of speculation and the desire to know everything. "If we cannot discover the reason why of everything, let us remember that we are infinitely inferior to God, having but received grace in part and having not yet reached equality with our Maker. Just as he who was but formed to-day is inferior to Him Who is uncreated; in the same measure is he inferior in regard to knowledge to his Maker. For thou, O man, art not an uncreated being, nor didst thou always exist with God, as His Word hath done. But through His superlative goodness thou hast received the beginning of thy creation and dost gradually learn

[1] Irenaeus used this word in its Greek sense of something relatively concealed, rather than in the Judaeo-Christian sense of something supernaturally revealed.

[2] II. 28. 6, in substance.

from the Word the dispensations of the God that made thee. Keep, therefore, within the bounds of thy knowledge and seek not as one who knows not what is good to surpass thy Maker: for He cannot be surpassed. Neither attempt to seek what is above Him, for such cannot be found. For thy Maker is not to be kept within bounds. Nor supposing that thou wert able to traverse all this universe in all its height and depth and length, wouldst thou be able to find any other than the Father Himself. If thou wilt try to do this, thou wilt fail and fall into the madness of conceiving thyself higher and wiser than thy Maker[1]."

In another passage Irenaeus bases his argument on an analogy between nature and revelation, saying in effect: "If we cannot find the solution of every scriptural difficulty, we should not be driven to seek another God. For that were gross impiety. All such matters we should leave in the hands of God. Many things are beyond our ken. These we commit to God. What reason can we give for the ebb and flow of the tide, the migrations of the birds, the formation of rain, lightning, thunder, the winds, the clouds, and the phases of the moon[2]? If, then, there are certain phenomena of nature which are hid from us, there is no ground for complaint if the scriptures contain many things too deep for us, which must be left to God, so that He should ever be the teacher and man the pupil[3]." As Origen said some years afterwards, "He who believes the Scriptures to have proceeded from Him Who is the Author of nature may well expect to find the same sort of difficulties in it as are found

[1] II. 25. 3.
[2] These phenomena are no longer mysteries.
[3] II. 28. 3, in substance.

in the constitution of nature[1]." We also notice how appropriately the analogical argument is used by Irenaeus, not so much to supply proofs as to repel disproof, not so much to convince as to confute. Bishop Butler developed this argument and its use in his *Analogy*.

Irenaeus agreed with the Gnostics in holding that the greatness of God is ineffable and inexhaustible, but he maintained that "He is by no means unknown; for all things learn through His Word that there is one God, the Father Who contains all things[2]." He may be indescribable; but yet we can reach after Him. "He is Reason, but not like our reason. He is Light, but not like that which we know as light. In no other respect is there any comparison between human littleness and the Father's greatness. We, indeed, speak of Him according to the love we bear Him, but our words cannot convey our sense of His greatness[3]." Like Whichcote[4], he held that man was made by God to know Him and to grow like Him.

But, he points out, the Gnostics, in strange inconsistency with their principles, ventured to name the Nameless, to expound the nature of Him Who is unspeakable and to search out Him Who is unsearchable[5], and, accordingly, they fell into the mistake of attributing the psychological conditions of man to the Maker. Hence they personified the various powers and attributes of God under the name of aeons or agencies, an absurdity which becomes apparent when we attempt, in a similar fashion, to personify the affections and qualities of man, for we cannot separate understanding from thought or thought from understanding[6].

[1] *Philocal.* p. 23.
[2] IV. 20. 6.
[3] II. 13. 4.
[4] Bishop Westcott's *Essays*, p. 379.
[5] I. 15. 5.
[6] II. 13. 1.

Irenaeus protests, like Origen, against anthropomorphism, saying: "They are ignorant of God who attribute human affections and passions to the Father of all, Whom they declare to be unknowable and never to have lowered Himself so much as to create the world. Whereas if they knew the Scriptures and had been taught by the truth, they would know, at any rate, that God is not like man, and that His thoughts are not as our thoughts. For the universal Father is superior to all human emotions and passions. His essence is simple, not composite, He is homogeneous, wholly like and equal to Himself, since He is all understanding and all spirit, all reason and all thought, all sight and all hearing, and altogether the source of all that is good[1]."

There are no differences or distinctions to be made in God. For with Him to think is to perform, as He is all thought and all will. "For He is over all, is all Nous and all Logos, and continues ever the same self-consistent Being[2]." "He speaks what He thinks and thinks what He speaks. And the Mind that embraces all things is the Father Himself. He, then, who speaks of the Mind of God and ascribes to it an origin of its own, as if God were one thing and the primal Mind another, makes Him out to be a compound Being[3]."

But no man can comprehend the vastness and goodness of God. "For it is evident to all," he writes, "that no man can declare the goodness of God from those things that are made; and that His greatness is not deficient, but contains all things and extends even to us, everyone who holds a worthy opinion of God will confess[4]." "He contains all things and is contained by

[1] II. 13. 3. [2] II. 13. 8. [3] II. 28. 5. [4] IV. 19. 3.

none[1]." "With the Name of God the following terms are synonymous: understanding, word, life, incorruption, truth, wisdom, goodness, and such like[2]." It is therefore absurd to attempt to conceive Him after the fashion of men. Everything approaching anthropomorphism and anthropopathism in the Deity is therefore condemned by Irenaeus. For we cannot infer what God is from what man is.

Such, he points out on several occasions, was the fatal mistake of the Gnostics. "They do not know what God is," he says, "but they imagine He sits like a man, and is contained, but does not contain[3]." "So they have plainly lied against God by combining, with some plausibility, the feelings of men, their mental exercises, the formation of their opinions and the utterances of their words. For while ascribing to the Divine Reason the things that happen to man and which they experience themselves, they do not seem to say anything improper in the opinion of those who have not the knowledge of God[4]."

Addressing his antagonists in the second book, he says: "You Gnostics affirm with apparent gravity and honesty that you believe in God, but you declare that He is the fruit of defect and ignorance. And this blindness has fallen upon you, because you reserve nothing for God. You are not satisfied unless you can set forth the generations and productions[5] of God Himself and of His Ennoia, His Logos, His Life and Christ. Of these things you form your ideas from a purely human experience, not understanding

[1] II. 30. 9.

[2] II. 13. 9, coobaudientur Harvey suggests is rendering of *συμφωνήσουσι*. Perhaps it means that in the Name of God are implied understanding etc.

[3] IV. 3. 1. [4] II. 13. 10. [5] 28. 4, *nativitates et prolationes*.

that it is possible to speak in this way of the mind and thoughts of man, who is a compound being, and that it is quite permissible to say in the case of man that thought comes from reason, intention from thought and word from intention, and that he is now at rest, now silent, and anon acting and speaking. But since God is all mind, all reason, all operating spirit, and all light and always the same—for so it is right and scriptural to think of God—such feelings and psychological distinctions cannot be found in Him." In another eloquent passage[1] he asserts that the Father is far removed from the affections and passions which prevail among men.

Although the poverty of human language prevents man from describing the nature of God, and the weakness of human intellect debars man from conceiving His goodness, God has many ways of approach to the human soul. Of these Irenaeus notes the following. In the first place, like his contemporary Tertullian, who appealed to the universal nature of the soul's witness to God's existence and to the testimony of the "soul naturally Christian," he declared that "while no one knows the Father except the Son, yet all things are aware of the fact of His existence, because the reason implanted in them (*ratio mentibus infixa*) reveals to them that there is One God, the Lord of all[2]." This is the *a priori* proof which was afterwards developed by Anselm. In a beautiful passage in II. 6. 1 he touches upon the *a posteriori* argument, the proof of natural theology: "Although God is invisible to man by reason of His eminence, as regards His Providence He cannot be unknown." "The

[1] II. 13. 3.

[2] II. 6. 1. The Latin has *omnia*, all things. Did Irenaeus believe in a universal, all-pervading reason?

things which are under the care and governance of that Providence must recognize their director[1]." In another passage he appeals to the universal consensus of opinion[2], pointing out that it has been "the universal opinion of men since the earliest age (lit. from the tradition of the protoplast) that there is one God, the Maker of heaven and earth." "The very heathen have learnt of Him from the bare creation, nature itself revealing the Author, the work suggesting the Artist, and the world manifesting its Designer." "The very system of creation to which we belong, so far as we can see it, bears witness to the unity of the Creator and Ruler[3]." "And if the natural revelation of God afford life to all things living on the earth, much more does the revelation of the Father by the Word give life to those who see God[4]."

This fine sentence carries us from natural religion to religion revealed. "The universal Scriptures, both the prophets and the Gospels, openly and clearly proclaim the unity of God, Who formed everything by His Word, things visible and invisible, things in heaven and things upon the earth[5]." "It is by reason of His love and infinite kindness that God has thus come within reach of human knowledge, not, however, to such an extent that we can measure His greatness or handle His essence[6]."

The *immensa benignitas* of Irenaeus reminds us of the words of a more modern but equally devout spirit:

> For the love of God is broader than the measures of man's mind,
> And the heart of the Eternal is most wonderfully kind.

But the personal knowledge of God he regards as the highest proof of all. On this point we find much in

[1] III. 25. 1.
[2] II. 9. 1, omnibus hominibus ad hoc demum consentientibus, veteribus quidem, et in primis a primoplasti traditione hanc suadelam custodientibus.
[3] II. 27. 2. [4] IV. 20. 7. [5] II. 27. 2. [6] III. 24. 2.

common between the Cambridge Platonist Henry More and Irenaeus. The aspiration after a lofty ideal of spiritual communion with the Divine is as strong in the Greek Father as it was in Henry More, who wrote with fervour in his *Exorcism of Enthusiasm* of "that true and warrantable enthusiasm of devout and holy souls," that "delicious sense of the Divine life" which the spirit of man receives; and who declared that "the oracle of God is not to be heard but in His Holy Temple, that is to say, in a good and holy man, thoroughly sanctified in spirit, soul and body." Both men of mystical mind were saved from fanciful speculation and unrestrained enthusiasm by practical sense and politics. In both the love of God was recognized as the source of man's knowledge of Him. As Irenaeus said, "As regards His greatness it is impossible to know Him, but as touching His love—for it is this that leads us to God through His Word—when we obey Him, we always learn that there is so great a God, Who hath by Himself established, arranged and adorned all things, and Who now contains both ourselves and this world of ours[1]." On another luminous page of brilliant thoughts which remind one of the beautiful legend, *theologum pectus facit*, to which Leonidas, the father of Origen, used to give expression by kissing the breast of his sleeping boy, and which is rendered in the couplet:

> 'Tis the heart and not the brain
> That the highest doth attain,

we read: "In respect to His greatness and His transcendent glory, 'no man shall see God and live,' for He is incomprehensible, but because of His love and kindness and infinite power He gives to those who love Him the

[1] IV. 20. 1.

vision of God of which the prophets did write. For man does not see God as he wishes himself, but when God pleases and by whom He pleases, and as He pleases He is seen by man. At that time He was seen prophetically in the Spirit, and adoptively through the Son, and will be seen paternally in the Kingdom of God. For as they who see the light are within the light and perceive its brilliancy, so are they who see God within God as they behold His splendour. That splendour gives them life. They therefore receive life who see God. Accordingly, He, Who is illimitable[1], incomprehensible, and invisible, brought Himself within the sight, understanding and comprehension of those who believe[2], in order that He might give life to those who embrace (*χωροῦντας*) and behold Him through faith. For as His vastness lieth beyond our sphere of research, His goodness is beyond our power of expression. It is through it that He gives life to those who see Him. For it is impossible to live without the principle of life, but the means of life are found in fellowship with God. To share in God is to see Him and enjoy His goodness[3]." "And through that vision men receive immortality, reaching even unto God[4]." Compare with all this the sixth, twenty-sixth, and twenty-seventh chapters of the tenth book of Augustine's *Confessions*.

In the sixth chapter of this fourth book he tells us that this personal revelation of the Father is made by the Word. "No man can know the Father save through the Word, that is, unless the Son reveals Him. Neither can one have knowledge of the Son unless the Father

[1] *ἀχώρητος*, lit. uncontainable.

[2] The Latin translator read *ἀνθρώποις* (hominibus) for *τοῖς πιστοῖς* and omitted *διὰ πίστεως*.

[3] IV. 20. 5, *μετοχὴ δὲ θεοῦ ἐστι τὸ γινώσκειν θεὸν καὶ ἀπολαύειν τῆς χρηστότητος αὐτοῦ*.

[4] IV. 20. 6, per visionem immortales facti et pertingentes usque in Deum.

pleases. His Word knows that the Father, as far as we are concerned, is unlimited by time or space, and invisible. But He has declared Him Who cannot otherwise be declared. And, on the other hand, it is the Father alone Who knows His own Word. Accordingly, the Son reveals the Father through His own manifestation. For the manifestation of the Son is the knowledge of the Father." Again he writes in the same chapter: "It is the Will of the Father that He should be known. For they who have received the revelation of the Son know Him." And yet again: "For the Word reveals the Creator by the creation itself, the Maker by the world, the Artist by His work, and the Father Who begat by the Son Who was begotten. And through the Word Himself made visible and palpable, the Father was manifested, although all do not believe in Him in the same way; but all saw the Father in the Son, for the Father is the invisible of the Son, while the Son is the visible of the Father[1]." "Therefore the Word reveals God to man, and presents man to God, preserving, however, the invisibility of the Father, in order that man might have an ideal to reach after, and at the same time not grow too familiar[2]." God also revealed Himself by the Spirit in visions to the prophets "so that man might be prepared and trained beforehand to be brought into His glory which shall be afterwards revealed to them that love God[3]." "For God will be seen by those who have His Spirit and await His advent[4]." "And when man is found in God, he will ever advance towards Him[5]." As Whichcote put it, "God is the centre of immortal souls."

[1] IV. 6. 6, invisibile etenim Filii Pater, visibile autem Patris Filius.
[2] IV. 20. 7. [3] IV. 20. 8. [4] IV. 20. 6. [5] IV. 11. 2.

In II. 26. 1 Irenaeus gives us the conclusion of the whole matter of man's knowledge of God in these words: "It is much better and more profitable, then, to belong to the simple and uncultured class and to get near to God by love, than to be found to be blasphemers through conceit of knowledge. For there can be no greater form of arrogance than to imagine oneself superior to the Creator. It is, therefore, better, as I said, that one should not know a single reason why anything in creation has been made, and believe in God and abide in His love, than to be inflated with knowledge of this kind and to fall away from the love which gives life to man. Better far is it to know nothing else save Jesus Christ the Son of God, Who was crucified for us, than to be led by subtle and hair-splitting questions into impiety." In the words of Hooker, the great Anglican controversialist, whose comprehensive mind and conservative temper remind one of Irenaeus: "Whom although to know be life and joy to make mention of His Name, yet our soundest knowledge is to know that we know Him, not as indeed He is, neither can know Him; and our safest eloquence concerning Him is our silence, when we confess without confession that His glory is inexplicable, His greatness above our capacity and reach. He is above and we upon earth; therefore it behoveth our words to be wary and few." The undertone of subdued devotion that murmurs in the *Treatise* is an overture to the passionate music of Augustine's *Confessions*: "I love Thee, Lord, with a conscience sure and steadfast. With Thy Word Thou hast pierced my heart and I have learned to love Thee[1]."

[1] Non dubia sed certa conscientia, Domine, amo te. Percussisti cor meum verbo tuo et amavi te (x. 6).

CHAPTER VIII

THE DOCTRINE OF THE TRINITY

THE number of passages of the treatise which bear on the subject of the Holy Trinity convince us that Irenaeus' confession of faith in the Trinity Holy and Undivided of Three Persons and One God was not merely the distinguishing feature of his belief, but the real foundation of his doctrines of God and man. Plato emphasized the transcendence of Deity in relation to the Creation, while Aristotle founded his system on the immanence of Deity in relation to the human intelligence. It was the merit of Irenaeus to see that the secret of life and thought and spirit lay in the reconciliation of these two ideas, the transcendence and immanence of God as He is above and as He is within the human personality, and that this reconciliation was made by the Christian doctrine of the Trinity.

The relation of the Trinity to the Creation is expressed in one lucid phrase "The Father is verily *above* all, and He is the Head of Christ, but the Word is through all things, and He is Himself the Head of the Church, while the Spirit is in us all, and He is the living water which the Lord gave to those who believe in Him and love him and know that there is one Father above all things and through all things and in all things[1]."

[1] v. 18. 2. In IV. 31. 2 he speaks of the Word of God as *pater generis humani*.

"Man is formed," he writes, "after the image of God, and he is fashioned by His Hands, that is, by the Son and the Spirit[1]." The Son is also called the Hand of God by Athanasius[2], a metaphor which, as Newman pointed out[3], is to be distinguished from the Arian term organon (*ὄργανον*), which implies separateness and dependence, whereas the term 'hand' implies consubstantiality. Irenaeus develops this idea in IV. 20. 1, where he says: "God did not require the assistance of such (i.e., angels or 'virtues') to effect His purpose, inasmuch as He had His Hands. For with Him are always present the Word and Wisdom, the Son and Spirit, by Whom and in Whom He freely and spontaneously made all things, to Whom also He said: 'Let us make man in Our image and likeness,' taking from Himself the substance of the creatures, the form of things made and the type of all that adorns the earth." See also V. 6. 1, "God shall be glorified in His work, which He has adapted and conformed to the image of His Son. For through the Hands of the Father, that is, the Son and the Spirit, man, and not merely a part of man, is made."

In V. 18. 2, he says: "The Father bears the creation and His Word at the same time." In V. 18. 1, the Father is described as *containing* the entire Pleroma. The Word's relation to the creation is similarly expressed in III. 11. 8, "The Word is the Artificer of all; He sitteth upon the cherubim and *contains* all things[4]." In V. 18. 3 he writes: "It is the Word of God that is the actual Creator of the world. But He is our Lord Who in recent times was made man, Who in an invisible

[1] IV. *Praef.* 3.
[2] *Orat.* II. 31, ὁ Πατὴρ, ὡς διὰ χειρὸς, ἐν τῷ Λόγῳ εἰργάσατο τὰ πάντα.
[3] *Athanasius* II. 450.
[4] συνέχων, Lat. *continet.*

manner contains (*continet*) all things created, and is immanent (*infixus*) in the whole creation and governs all things. Therefore He came visibly[1] unto His own and was made flesh. For it is He Who has authority over all things from His Father[2], since He is both the Word of God and very man, Who communicates with invisible beings after a rational manner (*rationaliter*), but (for the visible creation) ordains a law which is apparent to the senses (*sensualiter*), namely, that all things should persevere in their order. He reigns manifestly over things that are visible and pertain to the life of man." Notice the nice distinction here drawn between the relations of the Son of God to the invisible creation and to the visible.

The work of the Holy Spirit in the creation is also described. For as a Hand of the Father He helped to mould and fashion it. He is also said to "contain all things[3]." "The Spirit of God, by Whom all things were made, was united to and blended with the flesh, His workmanship[4]." "There is, therefore, One God Who by the Word and Wisdom created and arranged all things[5]."

The relation of the Divine Persons to the economy of man's salvation is more developed. Each Person of the Adorable Trinity plays His own special part in the scheme of revelation and redemption, and yet there is no trace of Tritheism. "For God is mighty in all

[1] Invisibiliter (Erasmus and Gallasius), but cf. v. 18. 1, visibile Verbum.

[2] "The difference between orthodox writers and heretics regarding the Son's ministration is that the former mean a ministration internal to the substance and an instrument connatural with the Father, and Arius meant an external and created medium of operation." Newman, *Athan.* II. 217.

[3] v. 2. 3, τοῦ συνέχοντος τὰ πάντα, qui continet omnia.

[4] IV. 31. 2.

[5] IV. 20. 4.

things, being seen at that time prophetically[1] through the Spirit, being seen also adoptively through the Son, and yet to be seen paternally in the Kingdom of Heaven. The Spirit truly prepares man for (or *in*)[2] the Son of God; the Son leads him to the Father, and the Father confers upon him incorruption with a view to eternal life, which comes to everyone from the vision of God[3]."

The following passage is found in IV. 20. 6: "God, as the prophets declared in figures, shall be seen by men who bear His Spirit and await His (v.l. Christ's) coming. Thus was God revealed. For God the Father is manifested through all these operations, the Spirit working, the Son administering, and the Father approving, while man's salvation was being accomplished[4]."

The Divine Persons cooperate together for the spiritual well-being and resurrection of man. "The whole plan of the salvation, which concerns man, was made according to the will of the Father so that God might not be conquered nor His work weakened[5]." It is through the Word that man will ascend and "be made after the image and likeness of God[6]." "So that we might recover in Christ Jesus what we had lost in Adam, namely, the being after the image and likeness of God[7]." This work is also attributed to "the whole grace of the Spirit" that will make man after that image and likeness in V. 8. 1 and to the Son and Spirit acting together in V. 1. 3. In V. 6. 1 it is through the Spirit that we obtain the similitude of God. "The

[1] Prophetice, v.l. prophetiae.
[2] In Filium (Ar.); in Filio (Cl. and Voss).
[3] IV. 20. 5.
[4] Spiritu quidem operante, Filio vero administrante, Patre vero comprobante, homine vero consummato ad salutem.
[5] III. 23. 1. [6] V. 36. 2. [7] III. 18. 1.

Word of the Father and the Spirit of God united (*adunitus*) to the ancient substance of Adam's creation, made (*effecit*) a living and a perfect man, holding (*capientem*) a Perfect Father." The singular of the participle and verb here implies a solidarity of union and work. He proceeds to say, "For Adam did not formerly escape the 'Hands' of God to which the Father said, 'Let us make man in our image and likeness.' And therefore at the end His 'Hands' perfected a living man, so that man (Adam) may be after the image and likeness of God[1]."

Again, in v. 2. 3 it is the Word of God Who giveth our bodies awakening (ἔγερσιν); but in v. 7. 2 we read, "our bodies rising through the Spirit become spiritual bodies." The Lord giveth life (*vivificat*) to man in III. 23. 7. The Spirit also giveth life (ζωοποιοῦν) in v. 12. 2.

In v. 36. 2 he records the following description of

> The great world's altar-stairs
> That slope thro' darkness up to God.

"The presbyters, the disciples of the Apostles, held that man ascended through steps of this kind, namely, through the Spirit to the Son and through the Son to the Father, and that in the course of time the Son will deliver up everything to the Father, so that God will be all in all[2]." The Son's work may be described as a *scala ascensionis*, a ladder of ascent to the Father. He sums up this argument in the fourth book[3], where he says: "Wherefore, then, in all things and through all things there is one God, the Father, and one Word, one Son and one Spirit, and one salvation to all that believe on Him[4]."

[1] v. 1. 3. [2] v. 36. 2. [3] IV. 6. 7.

[4] Massuet omits *unus*. It is not in Cl., Ar. or Voss MSS. *Filius* is also omitted by Stieren. But *unus* is necessary to the sense and balance of the sentence.

Thus the Three Persons of the Trinity work together for the salvation, resurrection and glorified life of man. The part of the Divine Persons in this work is further specified in the course of the treatise. "Thus were they perfected," he writes, "who knew one and the same God, Who from the beginning to the end is ever a present help to the human race by means of various dispensations[1]." The same phrase is used of the Word in IV. 28. 2: "For there is one and the same God the Father and His Word, Who has been an ever present help to the human race by means of many dispensations[2], doing many things and saving from the beginning those who are saved. These are they who love God and follow the Word of God as far as circumstances allow[3]." The relation of the Father to the Son is given in III. 6. 2 and IV. 38. 3, where the Father is represented as commanding and the Son as performing[4]. The same thought occurs in Basil[5], in Hippolytus, *Contra Noetum*, 14, and in Athanasius, *Orat.* I. 63, where the Son is represented as receiving and executing orders[6].

The Word is more particularly described in III. 16. 6: "The Only-Begotten Word of God, Who has been always present with the human race, united and blended with His own creation according to the Father's good

[1] III. 12. 13.

[2] Semper assistens humano generi variis quidem dispensationibus.

[3] Secundum suum genus, which may mean according to their race or birth or sex, generation or light.

[4] *τοῦ μὲν Πατρὸς εὐδοκοῦντος καὶ κελεύοντος, τοῦ δὲ Υἱοῦ πράσσοντος καὶ δημιουργοῦντος.* Cf. III. 8. 3, Cui ergo praecepit? Verbo scilicet.

[5] *de Spir. S.* 38. The Lord ordering (*προστάσσοντα*) and the Word framing.

[6] *προσταττόμενος καὶ ὑπουργῶν.* The latter expression is objectionable, as it implies that the Son was created as an instrument (*ὑπουργός*). It is doubtful if Athanasius used it in his own person, as *Orat.* II. 24 and 31 are against the idea that the Son was an *ὄργανον* of the Father. *δημιουργεῖν* (Irenaeus' word) is not open to the same objection.

pleasure, and Who became flesh, is our Lord Jesus Christ Himself, Who suffered for us and rose again on our behalf, and will come again in the glory of the Father to raise all flesh and to manifest salvation." "For He it is Who descended and ascended on account of the salvation of men[1]." "It was the very Word of God Who conversed with the patriarchs before Moses in a manner suitable to His Divinity and glory. But for those under the law He appointed a liturgical and sacerdotal order....Afterwards being made man, He sent the gift of the Heavenly Spirit upon the whole earth, sheltering us under His wings[2]."

Furthermore, we cannot be saved without the Holy Spirit, "the Lord and Giver of life." "The flesh, when destitute of the Spirit, is dead and without life...but where the Spirit of the Father is, there is a living man, for the flesh possessed by the Spirit, forgetful indeed of itself, but assuming the quality[3] of the Spirit, is made conformable to the Word of God. And, therefore, as we had our conversation in former times, in the oldness of the flesh and in disobedience to God, being without the Divine Spirit, let us now, receiving the Spirit, walk in newness of life and obedience to God. Seeing, then, that we cannot be saved without the Spirit of God, the Apostle exhorts us by faith and holy conversation to preserve the Spirit of God, lest we lose a share in the Holy Spirit and be deprived of the Kingdom of God, which, he declares, flesh and blood cannot inherit[4]."

Again he says: "Our Lord said, 'Let the dead bury

[1] III. 6. 2, descendit et ascendit *propter salutem hominum*. Cf. Nicene Creed.

[2] III. 11. 8.

[3] Qualitatem, character, cf. St Patrick, *Conf.* 6, opto fratribus...scire qualitatem meam.

[4] V. 9. 3.

their dead,' with reference to those who have not the Spirit, Who quickens man; whereas, on the contrary, as many as fear God and trust in the Advent of His Son and through faith have the Spirit of God established in their hearts, these shall justly be called pure and spiritual, because they have the Spirit of God, Who cleanses man and raises him to the life of God[1]." In the same paragraph he describes the saving and forming work of the Spirit[2]. In IV. 33. 14 he shows how the Spirit cooperates with the Word in the salvation of man. "He who is, indeed, spiritual," he says, "will interpret all these sayings of the prophets by referring them to that special part of the dispensation of God to which they belong, and by exhibiting the completeness (integrum corpus) of the work of the Son of God, and by always recognizing the same Word of God, Who has been but recently made manifest to us, and by ever acknowledging the same Spirit of God, Who has been but newly poured out upon us in these last times, even from the beginning of the creation to its end, from Whom they who believe in God and follow His Word receive that salvation which is from Him."

Irenaeus, however, differentiates the functions of the Word and the Spirit of God, regarding the Spirit as present in all the dispensations of God, of which the Word is Author. "The Spirit of God," he writes, "has been with men from the beginning in all the dispensations of God, announcing things future, revealing things present, and recording things past[3]." "But of both covenants, one and the same Householder, even the Word of God,

[1] V. 9. 1, 2.
[2] Altero quidem salvante et figurante qui est Spiritus.
[3] IV. 33. 1.

our Lord Jesus Christ, Who conversed with Abraham and Moses, Who restored to us our liberty afresh, and multiplied His grace upon us, is Author" (*produxit*)[1]. In IV. 20. 7 the Word is described as "the dispenser of the Father's grace," while the Spirit is represented as One Who has prepared man for the vision of God by the words of the prophets. "The Spirit of God forms and adapts us beforehand for obedience to God, that so being sanctified and instructed in the things pertaining to God by this preparatory discipline we may at last obtain the vision of God and the glory to be afterwards revealed in those who love Him" (IV. 20. 8).

A fine summary of his faith is given in *Apostolic Preaching*, c. vi.: "And this is the rule of our faith, the foundation of our building and the security of our walk, even God the Father, ingenerate, uncontainable, invisible, one God the Creator of all. This is the foremost article of our faith. The second is the Word of God, the Son of God, Christ Jesus our Lord, Who appeared to the prophets, in accordance with the form of their prophesying, and according to the course of the decrees of the Father, through Whom everything came into existence, Who at the end of the times appeared in visible and palpable manner[2] to bring all things to perfection, and sum up all things in Himself. A Man among men He became in order to destroy death, to make manifest the life, and to bring about a fellowship of union between God and man. The third article is the Holy Spirit, through Whom the prophets have prophesied, the fathers have learnt the things of God, and the righteous have been led in the way of righteousness, and Who shed Himself abroad at

[1] IV. 9. 1.
[2] Cf. per ipsum Verbum visibilem et palpabilem factum, IV. 6. 6.

the end of the times, in a new fashion upon mankind all over the world while He restored[1] men for God."

We now come to a rather complicated problem, in which it is difficult to mark the exact positions of Irenaeus—the relation of the Divine Persons of the Godhead to one another. In some passages the Persons are coordinated; while in others there seems to be a subordination in the relations of the Son to the Father and of the Spirit to the Son. Generally speaking, they are coordinated as touching their Divinity; but subordinated as regards their Divine functions. For example, "The Word received an universal authority from the Father[2]." In IV. 7. 4 he describes the Son as the "Offspring" (*progenies*) and the Spirit as the "Similitude" (*figuratio*) of the Father. Basil varies this sentence, writing "Christ is the image of God, but the Spirit is the image of the Son[3]." As a rule *Similitude* (εἶδος and μορφή) is descriptive of the Divine Substance in the person of the Son[4]. Again, the special function of the Son is the revelation of the Father, "The Father bearing witness to the Son and the Son announcing the Father[5]." See also IV. 6. 3 "The Father sends, but the Son is sent..." The Son administers all things for the Father, carrying them through from the beginning to the end, and without Him no man can know the Father. For the Son is the knowledge of the Father" (IV. 6. 7). "The Father is the invisible of the Son and the Son is the visible of the Father[6]." "The Father revealed Himself to all by making His Word

[1] Erneuerte, Lat. *renovavit.* Cf. Agnitio Dei renovat hominem (V. 12. 4.)
[2] V. 18. 2.
[3] *Adv. Eunom.* p. 116.
[4] Newman, *Athanasius*, II. 404.
[5] III. 6. 2. Cf. Mt. xi. 27. Jn. x. 15, etc.
[6] IV. 6. 7.

visible to all[1]." These complementary expressions "the visible" and the "invisible" save Irenaeus from the Arian taint which was afterwards attached to the word εἰκών or image. They show that he means that the Son is not a separate or external copy, but the exact reproduction of the Father. He advises his readers to avoid all abstruse and speculative questions concerning the relations of the Father and the Son. "For if the Son was not ashamed to reserve for God the knowledge of that day—we should not hesitate to reserve our difficulties for God. If any one should, therefore, say to us, 'How was the Son produced by the Father?' we reply that no one understands that production (*prolatio* = προβολή), generation, name or revelation, or whatever term is employed to express that ineffable generation...Seeing that His generation is ineffable, they are far astray who discuss generations and productions. The theory of emissions is no great discovery, nor is the ascription of an ordinary human process to the Only-Begotten a remarkable revelation[2]." In the *Apostolic Preaching*[3] he thus comments on Is. liii. 8, "Who shall declare His generation?": "This is added lest we should despise Him on account of His enemies and His sufferings. For He Who hath suffered all this hath a generation that cannot be described, for by His generation is meant His origin, that is, His Father, Who is ineffable and indescribable." Cf. IV. 33. 11, "He has an indescribable generation." This is after Justin, *Apol.* I. 51. In III. 6. 2 he expresses the oneness

[1] IV. 6. 3.

[2] II. 28. 6. Justin had used προβληθὲν γέννημα of the Son (*Tryph.* 62). Greg. Naz. (*Orat.* 29. 2) called the Father ὁ προβολεύς of the Spirit, but Irenaeus condemned the expression on account of its Valentinian tinge, and is followed by Origen and Athanasius.

[3] c. 70.

of the relation of the Father and the Son thus: "The Son is in the Father and has the Father in Himself," and in IV. 4. 2 he quotes with approval the saying: "The Father who is without measure (immensum) found His measure (mensuratum) in the Son: for the Son is the *measure* of the Father, seeing that He contains Him[1]," an expression which here denotes identity rather than limitation. It was not "the lingering effects of anti-theological interest[2]," but rather a strong sense of the reverence that is due to God, that restrained him from following in the steps of those who, to use his own phrase, would "play the part of midwife" to the Incarnate Word[3].

In some passages we find the Holy Spirit subordinated in His functions to the Father and the Son. The Spirit is "the Spirit of the Father, Who purifies man and raises him to the life of God[4]." He is the prophetic Spirit[5], "Who proclaimed through the prophets the dispensations of God[6]," "Who introduces (*σκηνοβατοῦν*) in each generation the dispensations of the Father and the Son, according to the Father's will," IV. 33. 7. Harvey renders *σκηνοβατοῦν* as *exponens* after the Latin qui... exposuit. Massuet gives the sense in *pervulgavit*. But the Greek word implies management as well as exposition, originally referring to stage-management. It is through the Spirit as well as the Word that God is manifested. "Sic igitur manifestabatur Deus...Spiritu quidem operante, Filio vero administrante" (IV. 20. 6). It is the

[1] Mensura enim Patris Filius quoniam et capit eum.
[2] Harnack, *History of Dogma*, II. 266.
[3] II. 28. 6. Hunc quasi ipsi obstetricaverint (Gr. *μαιεύεσθαι*).
[4] V. 9. 2.
[5] III. 11. 9...But see also IV. 20. 4, "prophetae ab eodem Verbo propheticum accipientes charisma," etc.
[6] I. 10. 1.

Spirit Who gives the knowledge of the truth (IV. 33. 7), and Who shares in the ministrations of the Son (IV. 7. 6). Ministrat ei...Filius et Spiritus sanctus. The Word, however, has a higher function than the Spirit. In V. 20. 2 he writes: "The Word uniting man to the Spirit and placing the Spirit in man, is made the Head of the Spirit and gives the Spirit to be the Head of the man." "The Father bearing His creation and His Word at the same time and the Word borne (*portatum*) by the Father give the Spirit to as many as the Father *wills*[1]." In V. 36. 2 he cites with approval the saying of a presbyter that "we ascend through the Spirit to the Son and through the Son to the Father." According to Dr Harnack[2], "he inverts this relation in IV. 38. 2, and says we ascend from the Son to the Spirit." But there he is interpreting the words of St Paul—"I have given you milk to drink, not food, for ye were not able to bear it": "That is," he remarks, "ye have been taught the parousia of the Lord in the form of man, but the Spirit of the Father doth not yet rest upon you." These words refer to the progressive nature of the revelation of God, not to any subordination of the Son as God to the Spirit as God, and are based on the Son's own teaching of Him Who was *with* His disciples and was to be *in* them[3]. See also IV. 38. 1 where he describes the reception by man of the Word, "the perfect Bread of God," as a preparation for the reception of "the Bread of immortality which is the

[1] V. 18. 2. *praestat*. The singular shows that the Father and the Son are one in the giving of the Spirit. Cf. IV. 20. 5, "qui portant Spiritum ejus": V. 8. 1, "assuescentes capere et *portare* Deum," and the names Θεοφόρος and Χριστοφόρος. But IV. 19. 1, "ut *portaret* Deum," of the Virgin has another sense.

[2] *Hist. of Dogma*, II. 267.

[3] John xiv. 17.

Spirit of the Father." In the *Apostolic Preaching* he says: "For the Son, as He is God, receives from the Father, that is, from God, the throne of the everlasting kingdom and the Unction as none of His fellows do, and the Unction is the Spirit with whom He is anointed[1]." And in III. 24. 1 of the Treatise he says: "The communication of Christ, that is, the Holy Spirit, the earnest (arrha = ἀρραβών) of incorruption, and the confirmation of our faith and the ladder of ascent to God." In III. 10. 3 Christ is called the Spirit; "Salvator quoniam Filius et Verbum Dei; salutare autem, quoniam Spiritus: *Spiritus*, enim inquit, *faciei nostrae Christus Dominus*[2]."

In other passages the same function is applied to both the Second and the Third Persons of the Holy Trinity. For instance, he says: "The whole grace of the Spirit which is given to man by God will render him like to God and will accomplish the will of the Father, for it shall make man after the image and likeness of God[3]." The concluding words of the treatise: "That the creature should contain the Word and rise to Him, passing beyond the angels, and be made after the image and likeness of God," attribute this work to the Word. See also IV. 33. 4 "The Son of God after Whose likeness man is made." The work of regeneration is, indeed, more particularly attributed to the Spirit, but it is also assigned to the Word. See V. 1. 1, "Who pours out the Spirit of the Father upon the union and communion of God and man, bringing down God to man by means of the Spirit, and raising man to God by His Incarnation,

[1] c. xlvii. Cf. III. 18. 3, unguentem Patrem et unctum Filium et *unctionem* qui est Spiritus (a reference to Isaiah lxi. 1).

[2] Thren. iv. 20. Heb. "The breath of our nostrils," LXX. πνεῦμα προσώπου ἡμῶν.

[3] V. 8. 1.

and bestows upon us truly and effectively immortality at His coming, through communion with Himself." They both are 'Hands' of the Father. Each plays His part in the revelation of the Father, the creation and regeneration of man, but the Word more particularly in the redemption[1] and the Spirit more especially in the sanctification of man[2]. "Spiritus Dei vivificat et auget hominem." But see *Apostolic Preaching*, c. vii. "The Baptism of our Regeneration passes through these three points, while God the Father graciously brings us to the new birth by means of His Son through the Holy Spirit. For they who carry the Spirit of God are led to the Word, that is, to the Son, but the Son leads them to the Father, and the Father permits them to receive incorruption. Therefore it is impossible without the Spirit to see the Word of God, and without the Son one may not approach the Father, for the knowledge of the Father is the Son, and the knowledge of the Son is through the Holy Spirit, but the Son gives the Holy Spirit in accordance with His own office and the Father's will to those whom the Father wills." This passage is a repetition of IV. 20. 5 of the treatise: "The Spirit preparing man for the Son of God, and the Son leading him to the Father, and the Father giving incorruption unto eternal life which follows from the vision of God" —where the distinct Functions of the Divine Persons are recognized.

The Trinity thus remains an integral whole, the Persons are not confused and the substance is not divided. "God is over all the only Uncreated One, the First of all and the Cause of all. And the Father

[1] V. 1. 1.
[2] IV. 20. 10.

approving and commanding, the Son ministering and moulding, and the Spirit nourishing and increasing, man makes gradual advance and ascends to the Perfect One, that is, he becomes nearest to the Uncreated One, for the Perfect One is Uncreated and He is God[1]." Their union is metaphorically described in III. 18. 3: "In the name of Christ is implied the Anointer, the Anointed and the Unction with which the Anointment has been made. It is the Father Who anoints, the Son Who is anointed, and the Spirit Who is the Unction, as the Word declares by Isaiah, 'The Spirit of the Lord is upon Me because He hath anointed Me,' thus indicating the anointing Father, the anointed Son and the Unction Which is the Spirit." The Holy Spirit is also styled *Unction* in *Apostolic Preaching*, c. xlvii. Dr Harnack[2] says of the former passage that "here the Personality of the Spirit vanishes." But see III. 6. 1, an explanation of Ps. xlv. 7: "Therefore God hath anointed Thee." "The Spirit," he says, "designates both the Father and the Son by the name of God, both Him Who is anointed, the Son, and Him Who doth anoint, that is, the Father." In IV. 33. 14 there is a strong passage on the Personality of the Spirit, "Who has been outpoured upon the human race from the very beginning until the end, from Whom they who believe in God and obey His word receive that salvation which He imparts." In the *Apostolic Preaching* the Third Person is yet more definitely described, e.g. c. xlix.: He takes form and shape in the prophets according to the character of the persons concerned, and sometimes speaks on the part of Christ and sometimes utters the word on the part of the

[1] IV. 38. 3. [2] l.c. II. 267.

Father." This is one of Justin's ideas. See *Apol.* I. 56. In the seventeenth chapter of the third book of the treatise there is an interesting dissertation on the Holy Spirit, "Who descended on the Son of God now become the Son of man, growing accustomed with Him to dwell in the race of man, the handiwork of God, renewing them in the new life of Christ, and carrying into effect the Father's will in them," "Who has power over all nations to admit to life and to unfold the New Testament," "Who leads into unity the distant tribes and offers the first-fruits of every nation to the Father." "By the Spirit our souls receive unity." "Which gift receiving from the Father, the Lord sendeth into all the world the Holy Spirit." In III. 17. 3 the words "And where we have an Accuser, there we also have the Paraclete" (Advocate), imply personality, for the work of such a Paraclete is personal.

"The eternity of the Son and Spirit is not absolute," writes Dr Harnack, when criticising this system. The fact is that Irenaeus never had to face the question: "Was there a time when the Son was not?" as later theologians have had to do. He distinctly states that the Son was *always* coexistent with the Father[1]. "For thou art not uncreated, O man, neither wast thou always existing with God, as His own Word was." And he writes in III. 18. 1: "Non *tunc* (at Incarnation) coepit Filius Dei existens semper apud Deum." But it is a question whether *semper* implies the eternity of the Son *a parte ante*, *semper* being vague. Would he say with Tatian, Theophilus and Tertullian that "The Word was not fully a Son from eternity, but that when,

[1] II. 25. 3, "semper coexistebas Deo."

according to the Divine counsels, the creation was in immediate prospect, and with reference to it, the Word was born into Sonship and became the Creator, etc.[1]"? The answer may be found in IV. 20. 3: "We have proved in many ways that the Word, Who is the Son, was always with the Father, and that the Wisdom, Who is the Spirit, was present with Him before the whole creation," and in IV. 20. 1: "For the Word is always with Him, and Wisdom also, that is, the Son and the Spirit, by Whom and in Whom He (the Father) made all things." He does not contemplate a time when either was not, nor does he hesitate to regard either as Divine. In his prayer for his readers he felicitously invokes the Triune God: "Wherefore I invoke Thee, Lord God of Abraham...Who art the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ...Who madest heaven and earth, Who rulest over all, the only true God, above Whom there is no other God, grant by our Lord Jesus Christ the ruling power of the Holy Spirit[2]." He also describes these relations in IV. 20. 4, where the Word announces the Divine plan of revelation and redemption for man "so that man having embraced the Spirit of God may pass into the glory of the Father." In his interpretation of the parable of the Good Samaritan he thus expounds the relations of the Divine Persons: "The Lord commended to the Holy Spirit His man (i.e. humanity, hominem) who had fallen among thieves, upon whom He Himself had shown mercy, giving two denaria[3], so

[1] Newman, *Athanasius*, II. 233. Hippolytus in his tract against Noëtus goes further than Irenaeus. He appears to hold that the Logos which dwelt in the Deity from eternity as His unspoken word assumed a separate hypostatic existence at a definite time by the will of God. V. art. *Hippolytus Romanus*, Smith and Wace, *D.C.B.*, vol. III. 97.

[2] III. 6. 4.

[3] Also neuter in Plautus, *Rudens*, 2. 5. 27, as in Greek.

that we, receiving through the Spirit the image and superscription of the Father and the Son, might make good use of the coin placed to our credit[1]." In this passage we have a popular exposition of the relations of the Divine Persons to One Another and to man.

Perhaps we may be allowed to insert here the conclusions to which we were led by our examination of the doctrine of the Trinity in the *Apostolic Preaching* of Irenaeus, as criticized by Dr Harnack, in *Hermathena*[2]. Although the references to Church doctrine are of necessity casual and informal in the tract, we found many striking parallels to the positions of Irenaeus in both Nicene and pre-Nicene writers; and in response to Dr Harnack's criticism we saw (1) that in some places the relationship of the Father and the Son in Irenaeus appears to be conditioned by the essence of God Himself and independent of the sphere of redemption. That the whole economy of God does not refer to man (*pace* Dr Harnack[3]) in this system may be shown by such passages as *Adv. Haer.* II. 30. 9, where the Son is represented as revealing the Father to Angels and Archangels, Principalities and Powers, and c. 9 of the tract, where the economy of God includes the angel host who glorify the Father in heaven. Although Irenaeus regards the nature of Deity from the standpoint of man and describes it, therefore, in terms of human needs; and although in consequence the Incarnation is his great concern, and his thoughts are fixed upon it in such a way that the Divine Persons

[1] III. 17. 3. It is unnecessary to refer to IV. 20. 12 where the *three* (?) spies suggest the Trinity to Irenaeus, as it is founded on an error.

[2] "The Apostolic Preaching of Irenaeus and its light on the doctrine of the Trinity." *Hermathena*, 1907, pp. 307—337.

[3] *Hist. of Dog.* II. 266.

have interest for him chiefly as they effect the regeneration and salvation of men, such passages as the above show that man is not altogether the centre of his system, and that he could think of the Trinity apart from their relations to humanity. He would not say that the Word of God came into existence on our account, but rather that we were made on His account (cf. Athanasius *Orat.* ii. 31). (2) We found that if Irenaeus does not describe the absolute eternity of the Son in the manner of Athanasius, it is because he does not consider the subject from the same metaphysical standpoint and does not venture to discuss the ineffable genesis of the Son; and that if he makes the Word dependent on the supreme will of the Father, he is followed by Athanasius (pp. 323—324). (3) It seemed to us that in the tract the Monarchia of the Father is more pronounced (p. 315), while the Being and Initiative of the Son assume a unique importance in the economy of creation and men (p. 313); and (4) the Personality of the Spirit, if at times seemingly confused with the Divine Logos (pp. 318, 325), is more vividly described in the tract than in the treatise (p. 333).

In conclusion, Irenaeus' doctrine of the Trinity may be summed up as a belief in One and the Same God, manifested to men in a threefold Personality, Absolute, Eternal, coordinated essentially as touching the Divine Nature, but admitting of historical subordination as touching the Divine Office. Under the guidance of Father, Son and Spirit man is enabled to attain the end of his existence. Fashioned by the 'Hands' of the Father, moulded and redeemed by the Son, nourished and regenerated by the Spirit, and with the approval and under the direction of the Father, man ascends

gradually to the Uncreated One. As Origen writes, "By the unceasing action of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit towards us, renewed at each successive stage of our advance, we shall be able, with difficulty perhaps, at some future date to gaze upon the Holy and Blessed Life[1]."

[1] *De Princ.* I. 3. 8.

CHAPTER IX

THE INCARNATE WORD

THE Apologists sought to establish the subordinate position of Greek philosophy to Christian revelation. In this effort they were forced to define the articles of the faith more fully and to compile Scripture proofs. Of these articles those of the Holy Trinity and the Incarnate Word are chief. The former doctrine has already been considered. The latter, which is the subject of this chapter, seems to have been then in a state of chrysalis. Zahn in his *Marcellus of Ancyra*, p. 233, points out that Christ as the Word is now represented as the thought of the world within the mind of God, now as the thought that thinks in God, now as an Ego in God's thinking essence, and occasionally as the reason of God. Such indefiniteness regarding the nature and position of the Logos prevailed among the Apologists. It was left for Tertullian and Irenaeus to return to the Johannine position that the Son of God is the Logos. And Irenaeus from a deep study of Pauline theology, to which his controversy with Gnosticism forced him, declared that the Incarnation of the Son of God led to the divinity of man and the vision of God. From the time of Irenaeus the Incarnate Word became the central doctrine of Christianity and

the starting-point of every theological system. It is also self-evident that it was his controversy with Gnosticism that helped him to formulate his Christology, to present a view of the definite Personality of Christ, and to attach a specific importance to His personal influence and thus supplement what was lacking in the system of the Apologists.

Professor Harnack seems to regard the Logos-idea as the result of a compromise between Christianity and philosophy, a sort of bridge by which Christian tradition was united to Greek theology, but with Irenaeus, at all events, the religion of the Incarnation was not a mere adherence to a rational idea, it was faith in a Divine Person as well; it was not solely a *modus vivendi* between Christian doctrine and philosophy, but it was also the motive and inspiration of life; it was less the argument of a Divine thought than the influence of a Divine power, and so was a religion rather than a gnosis. We, therefore, give him no less than his due when we acknowledge that he was not only the first of the great ecclesiastical writers who assigned its due significance to the Person of Christ, but also the first who made his Christology the centre of a systematic cosmology, anthropology and theology. It would, indeed, have been hard for him not to have made the supreme influence in his life the starting-point and goal of his theological speculations.

As the Creator of all things the Word was to sum up all things in Himself, all things both in heaven and earth[1]; and thus to contain the promise and potency of the final consummation and reunion of all things in Himself. In His relation to Humanity, He was not

[1] v. 20. 2.

to be merely the Revelation of God, as the Apologists regarded Him, He was also to be the salvation of man. For by His work of recapitulation He summed up and brought to a head in Himself the whole human race, its every age and condition, its enmity, its suffering and its death[1], that He might redeem it from evil and restore it to its pristine state, and "that as it was through a beaten man our race descended to death, through a victorious Man we might ascend to life[2]." The treatise concludes with words of strong hope that humanity will realize its destiny at the last, and that "ascending to the Word and passing beyond the angels, man will be made after the image and likeness of God."

It cannot be denied that the Logos-doctrine of Irenaeus in his treatise is a complicated subject. But it is fundamental in his system, in which it takes root and life as the doctrine of the Incarnate Word, the Revealer of the Father, the Redeemer of man, and the Creator of the world. In his doctrine of the Word as the Revealer of God, he manages to reconcile in one Person the antitheses of the Gnostic conception, the Creation and the Redemption. The Word of God was for him the objective revelation of the Father in the works of nature; and also the means of the subjective revelation of God in the hearts of men. In that sense He is "the Visible of the invisible Father[3]." The Incarnation is an extension of the Creator's life in His creation, and the salvation of man (the microcosm) is a continuation of the history of the world (the macro-

[1] v. 21. 1, 2; v. 23. 2. See III. 22. 3 qui omnes gentes exinde ab Adam dispersas, et universas linguas, et generationem hominum cum ipso Adam in semetipso recapitulatus est.

[2] v. 21. 1.

[3] IV. 6. 6.

cosm). For the Word of God is "the Father of the human race[1]": the Revealer of the Father and the Son[2], Who is the minister of the Father, and Who accomplishes everything from beginning to end[3], and Who sums up His own handiwork in Himself[4]. In a word, He is "all things," in Whom all the fulness (pleroma) of the Godhead dwells, and all the creation is recapitulated[5], and in Whom all things were made[6]."

Steeped as Irenaeus was in the theology of St Paul, he could not but be fascinated by that Apostle's frequent and picturesque allusions to the cosmical relation of Christ to all things in heaven and earth in the Epistles to the Colossians and Ephesians. The chief quotations from these letters are: "In Him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead[7]"; "holding the Head, from whom the whole body joined together maketh increase[8]," quoted differently in IV. 32. 1, and V. 14. 4. He frequently expresses the hope that the creation which has shared in the ruin shall also participate in the restoration of man. At the conclusion of the treatise he says that "the Apostle has said that the creation shall be redeemed from the bondage of corruption into the liberty of the glory of the sons of God. And in all these things and by them all the same God the Father is manifested Who fashioned man." Again he says that the Word reveals the Creator by the creation itself[9]. This universal application of the results of the Incarnation is a proof of the

[1] Pater autem generis humani Verbum Dei—IV. 31. 2; cf. "Everlasting Father." (Is. ix. 6, rather than "Father of booty," see Fuerst under עַד.)

[2] per ipsam conditionem revelat Verbum conditorem Deum...et per Filium Eum Patrem qui generaverit Filium—IV. 6. 5.

[3] IV. 6. 7.

[4] Suum plasma in semetipsum recapitulans—IV. 6. 2.

[5] I. 3. 4. [6] I. 4. 5. [7] Col. ii. 9.

[8] Col. ii. 19. [9] IV. 6. 6.

comprehensive nature of his mind and of that power of reconciling opposites which was no less remarkable in the domain of theological thought than in the world of Church politics.

In the first place he treats the Incarnation as a mystery incomprehensible to angels. "For there is One Son Who performed the will of the Father, and one race of man, in which are wrought the mysteries of God, Whom[1] the angels desire to see, but they cannot understand the wisdom of God by which His own creation, conformed to and incorporated with His Son, is brought to perfection; or that His Offspring, the First-Begotten Word, could descend to the creature and be contained by him; and, on the other hand, that the creature could contain the Word and ascend to Him[2]."

The glory of the Incarnate Word is described in measured phrase that recalls the language of Ignatius[3] in III. 16. 6, where the Divine Nature of the Word is set forth as compelling adoration and the human as winning affection; and where also the Word is chiefly described as the recapitulation of our humanity, and so as the Lord and Saviour of the race of man. "Therefore," he writes, "there is one God the Father, and one Jesus Christ our Lord, Who cometh by a universal dispensation and summeth up all things into Himself[4].

[1] 1 Pet. i. 12, *quem* evidently mistake for *in quae* which is read in IV. 34. 1; II. 17. 9; *εἰς ἃ* is the N.T. reading.

[2] V. 36. 3.

[3] *Eph.* 7. "There is one Physician, both in the flesh and in the Spirit, made and not made, God become flesh, true life in death, of Mary and of God, first passible, then impassible," *πρῶτον παθητὸς καὶ τότε ἀπαθής*, cf. *ad Polycarp.* 3.

[4] veniens per universam dispositionem et omnia in semetipsum recapitulans (cf. Eph. i. 10). Massuet read *in semetipsum*, into Himself, instead of *in semetipso*, after Clerm. MS. His note on the meaning of *ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι* is "id est, universam hominum et angelorum salutem,

Man is in every respect the formation of God, and, therefore, He recapitulates man into Himself, the invisible becoming visible, the incomprehensible becoming comprehensible, the one superior to suffering becoming subject to suffering, and the Word becoming man. Thus He summeth up all things in Himself, that as the Word of God is supreme in heavenly and spiritual and invisible matters He may also have the dominion in things visible and material; and that by taking to Himself the pre-eminence[1] and constituting Himself Head of the Church He may draw all things in due course to Himself. With Him nought is unfinished or untimely... And the saying of Paul, 'When the fulness of time was come God sent His Son' means that our Lord being one and the same, both rich and great, accomplished in their appointed order and season and time all things that existed in the foreknowledge of the Father. For He zealously performs the bountiful and manifold will of the Father, being the Saviour of those who are being saved, the Lord of those who are under His dominion, and the God of all things which have been made, the Only-Begotten of the Father, both the Christ Who was foretold, and the Word of God, Who became incarnate, when the time was fulfilled in which the Son of God should become the Son of Man."

Irenaeus does not, however, go as deeply into the relations between the Father and the Son as Origen did. The latter's doctrine of the generation of the Son was summed up by Gregory Thaumaturgus in the phrase "One God, One from One, God from God, the impress

adeoque cunctam omnium rerum caelestium et terrestrium summam ad unum Christum revocare ac in eo unico comprehendere."

[1] *primatum*, later in sense of primacy.

and likeness of the Godhead, energising Word, Wisdom embracing universal system, Power producing universal creation, Very Son of Very Father, the Invisible of the Invisible, the Incorruptible of the Incorruptible, the Immortal of the Immortal, the Everlasting of the Everlasting[1]." But there are many similar phrases in Irenaeus, such as "The Visible of the Father" regarding the revelation of the Father by the Son. In one striking formula—*Filius Dei filius hominis factus est*[2], Irenaeus sums up the Incarnation. In IV. 6. 7 he declares that "the Father, the Spirit, the creation, man, the apostate spirits, the demons, the enemy, and death itself, all bear witness to the fact that the Son is Very God and Very Man."

He has stated in many places the positions of the heretics on this subject. The theories held by the Gnostics on the subject of our Lord were many, but by no school of Gnosticism was He regarded as really human or really divine. The shortest summary of their views is in III. 16. 8: "They are outside the pale of Christianity who, under the cloak of knowledge, understand Jesus to be one and Christ another, and the Only-Begotten a third, different from whom again is the Word, and say that the Saviour is yet another creature, being an emission from those who became aeons in a state of degeneracy." These divisions of the Personality and Nature of Jesus Christ give point to the words of our Creed—"And in one Lord Jesus Christ."

In the passage III. 11. 3 we have a summary of the various heresies on the Virgin-birth. "According to

[1] ἀόρατος ἀοράτου καὶ ἄφθαρτος ἀφθάρτου καὶ ἀθάνατος ἀθανάτου καὶ ἀΐδιος ἀϊδίου, see Caspari *Quellen*, vol. IV. p. 10.

[2] III. 19. 1.

them," he writes, "neither the Word nor Christ nor the 'Saviour' was made flesh[1]. They hold that neither the Word nor the Christ ever came into this world, that the Saviour never really became incarnate or suffered, but that He descended as a dove upon that Jesus who was of the dispensation, ὁ ἐκ τῆς οἰκονομίας, and then when He had proclaimed the Unknown Father, He again ascended into the Pleroma. Some, indeed, assert that this dispensational Jesus[2], whom they say passed through Mary as through a tube (ὡς διὰ σωλῆνος, I. 7. 2), became incarnate and suffered; while others again declare that Jesus was born of Joseph and Mary, and that the Christ of the upper realms, being without flesh and the capacity of suffering, descended upon him. But according to no school of the Gnostics did the Word of God become incarnate." Either He was not a true Word or it was not a true incarnation. The Ritschlian school have attempted to solve the problem by maintaining an historic Christ with the religious value of God, that is, as a fact not of science but of faith. We are grateful for the presentation of a non-metaphysical, historical view of Christ, but such must be constructed on historical principles. There can be no religious value for us in

[1] caro (σάρξ), synecdoche for human nature in its entirety. Apollinaris founded his theory upon the fact that the Scripture says "the Word was made *flesh*"—not *spirit*, and therefore put the Logos into the place of the νοῦς or rational spirit of His humanity. This was his solution of the difficulty of two integral persons forming one person, an ἀνθρωπό-θεος, which he declared was a monstrosity. His own theory necessitated a truncated humanity. We regard the personality of Christ as residing wholly in the Logos.

[2] The body of this dispensational Jesus is described in I. 9. 3 as "psychical but fashioned by a wonderful arrangement so as to be seen and felt." Harvey says (I. 60), "Thus we may trace back to the Gnostic period the Apollinarian error, closely allied to Docetic, that the body of Christ was not derived from the Blessed Virgin but that it was of heavenly substance, and was only brought forth into the world by her instrumentality."

that which has no metaphysical foundation, unless we prefer fancies to facts. Dr Denney (*Studies in Theology*, p. 14) well says, "We must as rational beings try to clear up in our minds what is necessarily involved in the existence among men of a person who has the religious value of a God. Theologians who refuse to go beyond this are invariably found to cover, under the guise of a religious indifference to metaphysics, a positive disbelief of everything which gives Christ's Godhead an objective character. They do not admit the supernatural birth; they do not admit the pre-existence taught by St Paul; they do not admit the doctrine of the Incarnation of the Logos, at least as taught by St John."

Irenaeus again refers to the Incarnation in III. 19. 1, driving home his argument with Scripture proofs, and saying: "They who regard Him merely as man and the son of Joseph, continuing in the bondage of the old disobedience, die apart[1] from the Word of God and without the freedom that is given through the Son. For ignoring Him Who is God with us, the Virgin-born Emmanuel, they are deprived of His gift, which is eternal life; and not receiving the Word of incorruption, they remain in mortal flesh; and become debtors to death through not accepting the antidote of life...They despise the Incarnation of the pure generation[2] of the Word of God, and robbing man of that ascent to God, show ingratitude to the Word of God, Who became incarnate on their behalf. For the Word became *man*,

[1] *nondum commixti* Verbo = χωρὶς Λόγου, lit. not yet blended with the Word. Harvey offended by the expression suggests *conjuncti*. An equally strong word *counitus* (συνηνώθη) had been used in the previous chapter, III. 18. 7, of the union of God and man by Christ the mediator in the Clerm. and Voss. MSS., for which Grabe read *conjunctus*.

[2] *purae generationis*, not *conception*. Irenaeus is thinking of the Divine operation, not of the human conception in the birth of Jesus.

that man, united with[1] the Word and receiving His adoption, might become the son of God. For we could not otherwise enjoy incorruption and immortality unless we had been united to incorruption and immortality. And how could this be done unless incorruption and immortality were first made that which we are so that the corruptible might be absorbed by the incorruption, and the mortal by immortality, and that we might enjoy the adoption of sons?"

In IV. 33. 4 he argues with the Ebionites and demands, "how can they be saved unless He be God Who wrought them salvation upon earth? And how will man pass up to God if God did not pass into man? And how will he escape the generation of death unless he enter a new generation, wondrously and unexpectedly given by God, even a regeneration by faith? Or what adoption will they obtain from God remaining thus in this their natural human state?"

In this passage, only in the Latin, one might imagine at first sight that he was speaking of salvation in connection with the Virgin. The whole passage runs so: "quemadmodum autem relinquet mortis generationem, si non in novam generationem mire et inopinate a Deo, in signum autem salutis, datam, quae est ex Virgine per fidem, regenerationem?" This sentence

[1] τὸν λόγον χωρήσας, commixtus Verbo, Latin. The Greek is taken from the Dialogues of Theodoret (1. 4. 53), who seems to have altered the Greek word of which *commixtus* is a rendering, owing to the support it might give to the views of Eutyches, then in vogue. The Greek word was either συγκραθείς or συγκεκραμένος. At Constantinople 448 ἡ ἀσύγχυτος ἕνωσις, the union without confusion of the natures, was maintained against the monophysitism of Eutyches. Massuet holds that *commiscere* may express union without confusion, quoting from a sermon of Leo who was an opponent of Eutyches, "ita ut natura alteri altera misceretur." The reference here is not, however, to the Incarnation but to that union of God and man which resulted from it. See previous note on "nondum commixti Verbo."

is difficult owing to the parenthesis, *in signum autem salutis*. The reference is obviously to Is. vii. 14, "The Lord Himself shall give you a sign: Behold the virgin shall conceive (or, is with child) and bear a son and shall (or, thou shalt) call his name Immanuel." Massuet himself did not see an allusion here to the Virgin but to the Church. He wrote: "per Virginem autem hic intelligit auctor non B. Mariam Christi matrem, sed Ecclesiam, uti constat ex loco parallelo infra n. 11. Verbum caro erit et Filius hominis, purus pure puram aperiens vulvam, *eam quae regenerat homines in Deum*, quam ipse puram fecit" (IV. 33. 11). "Nec enim haec appositio: *eam quae regenerat homines in Deum* ulli alteri quam Ecclesiae convenire potest." He felt the inconsistency of making Irenaeus attribute the regeneration of mankind to the Virgin, which he nowhere does. In III. 22. 4, when contrasting Eve and Mary as two women, he said that, "the Virgin through her obedience became the means of salvation (causa facta est salutis) both for herself and the whole human race." And he proceeded to assert that the Lord[1], who was born the firstfruits of the dead, receiving into His own bosom the ancient fathers, regenerated them into the *life of God*[2]. In III. 21. 5 the *partus*, child or bearing, of the Virgin being unexpected (inopinatus) is the God-given sign of a salvation also unexpected (inopinata). In III. 19. 3 the sign is that a virgin[3] should conceive, and bear

[1] Primogenitus enim mortuorum natus Dominus.

[2] Cf. II. 22. 2. omnes, qui per *eum* (Christum) renascuntur in Deum.

[3] The Hebrew עַלְמָה *'almah* has been rendered correctly *παρθένος* in LXX., but by Aquila and Theodotion (converts to Judaism) wrongly *νεᾶνις*. By some the reference is found in Is. viii. 3. Taking the word on its own merits we find it used in Gen. xxiv. 43, of the "virgin" destined to be the bride of Isaac; in Ex. ii. 8, of Miriam who was a virgin, in Ps. lxviii. 26, of virgins playing in a Temple procession; in Cant. i. 3, vi. 8, of unmarried

a son, and that He (hunc partum) should be *Deus nobiscum* (Immanuel). In III. 20. 3, Emmanuel Himself, the Virgin-born, is the sign of our salvation, "Ergo signum salutis nostrae eum qui ex Virgine Emmanuel est." Grabe adds *dedit*. In several passages the human descent of the Virgin-born is referred to, e.g. III. 16. 2 eam, quae est secundum hominem, generationem ejus ex Virgine; III. 21. 4 *generationem* ejus quae (est) *ex Virgine*; III. 21. 5 Regem, hic est qui ex Virgine...generatus est; III. 21. 5 generationem ejus qui erat futurus ex Virgine; III. 21. 1 ipse Dominus salvavit nos, ipse dans Virginis signum.

From these passages we would infer that the Virgin-birth was regarded by Irenaeus as a sign of our salvation, but that the Virgin-born Himself, Who needed not salvation, is the author of our salvation. There are accordingly two ways of explaining the passage before us. We may regard the Virgin-birth as a sign of our new birth, the regeneration which is by faith. *Quae est ex Virgine* would then refer back to *generationem*—see III. 16. 2 and III. 21. 5 quoted above—not to *salutis*. The rendering would then be as follows: "How will he escape the generation of death unless he pass into a new generation, wonderfully and unexpectedly given by God, like the Virgin-birth—which was the sign of our salvation—a new birth which is by faith?"

The other way would be to see in this passage a reference not to the Virgin-birth but to the *Virgin-born*, qui est ex Virgine, as in III. 19. 1 eum qui ex Virgine est Emmanuel, and III. 18. 2 qui ex Virgine est Emmanuel. This would necessitate the change of *quae*[1]

women; and in Prov. xxx. 19, where a pure maid is distinguished from an adulteress. Irenaeus (III. 21. 5) remarks that there would be no sign in the conception of an *adolescentula*.

[1] *quae* might easily be explained as the result of attraction to *datam*.

to *qui* and would read, "A new birth wonderfully and unexpectedly given by God—the sign of our salvation—Who is the Virgin-born, even a new birth by faith." This meaning would be closely connected with the immediately preceding sentence, "How shall man pass into God, if God did not pass into man" (*si non Deus in hominem*)?

It is also worthy of note that we find here the expression "ejusdem substantiae" (ὁμοούσιος) in this passage. It also occurs in II. 17. 2, etc.[1]

Irenaeus continues: "And therefore He Himself in the end displayed that likeness (i.e. of God), the Son of God becoming the Son of Man, taking up His ancient creation into Himself." When arguing with the Marcionites, who denied the reality of His humanity, and asserted that He was the enemy of the Creator, he asks how it was that blood and water came from the pierced side, and how it was that He declared that the bread of this our creation was His body, if He belonged to another Father than the Creator[2].

To the question "Who was the Word?" Irenaeus gives two remarkable answers in V. 18. 1 and III. 18. 1, in which he maintains His pre-existence, sets forth His relation to the Father, and declares that the Incarnation was the extension of His creative and immanent energy. In V. 18. 1 the Word of God is described as the Creator, Who is existent all the time in the world, and contains after an invisible manner[3] all the things that are made, and is immanent (*infixus*) in the whole creation. In

[1] I. 5. 4, ὁμοούσιον τῷ θεῷ; I. 11. 3, δύναμις ὁμοούσιος; II. 17. 2, vel generationes Patris erunt ejusdem substantiae ei et similes generatori. See also Clement *Strom.* IV. 13. 91 αὐτοῖς ὁμοούσιος.

[2] IV. 33. 2.

[3] Or according to His invisibility (secundum invisibilitatem).

III. 18. 1 the Word is described as *always existing* with God, and always present with the human race, with which He was united when He became a man subject to suffering. And when He became incarnate and was made man He summed up in Himself the long line of humanity, giving us salvation in a concrete manner, *in compendio*, so that what we lost in Adam, namely, the being in the image and likeness of God, we might recover in Christ Jesus. He is utterly unlike anything in the creation. "Nec quidquam ex his quae constituta sunt, et in subjectione sunt, comparabitur Verbo Dei" (III. 8. 2). "For the kings that are made are different from Him Who made them" (III. 8. 3). And the Word is "the Maker (τεχνίτης) of all things, Who contains all things" (III. 11. 8), "the creator, maker, and fashioner (ποιητής) of all things" (I. 15. 6); "Who is by nature invisible (IV. 24. 2)"; "invisible, incomprehensible and impassible[1], and chief among the supercelestial, spiritual and invisible beings, and yet He became visible, comprehensible, and capable of suffering" (III. 16. 6).

With regard to His generation Irenaeus deprecates the example of those "who conceive the 'emission' of the Logos or the Word after human analogy, and indulge in rash speculation concerning God, saying with a grand air that speech (logos) is emitted from thought (nous). This is, indeed, true as regards man; but in the case of Him Who is God over all, such an emission is not logical, seeing that He is all thought and all speech, and has nothing in Himself before or incon-

[1] ἀπαθής, cf. Athanasius, *Orat.* III. 34, Christ suffered "οὐ θεότητι ἀλλὰ σαρκί, the Word Himself being ἀπαθής in His nature." See also Ignatius, *ad Polyc.* 3, τὸν ἀπαθῆ...τὸν δὲ δι' ἡμᾶς παθητόν.

sistent with another, but is altogether equal, similar, and homogeneous[1]" (II. 13. 8).

It would seem that at times Irenaeus allowed himself to use φωνή (vox) as a substitute for the Logos, e.g. V. 16. 1 "Pater cujus *vox* ab initio usque ad finem adest plasmati suo" (cf. IV. 28. 2 "Verbum ejus qui semper humano generi adest"), V. 15. 4 "(Deus) in novissimis temporibus per eandem *vocem* visitavit exquirens genus ejus," and V. 17. 1 "Significans quoniam ipse est vox Dei per quam accepit homo praecepta." This, however, does not bear out the theory of Kunze that Irenaeus "never understood the expression λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ in the sense of reason but only in the sense of the spoken word" (*Gotteslehre des Ir.* p. 54). For even if II. 28. 4 "aliud enim est secundum Graecos logos, quod est principale quod excogitat; aliud organum per quod emittitur logos" may "read like an interpolation" (Harvey), he wrote in II. 17. 7 "Nus Pater et Pater Nus. Necesse est itaque et eum qui ex eo est Logos, immo magis ipsum *Nun, cum sit Logos*, perfectum et impassibilem esse" and in II. 13. 1 he defines Nus as "ipsum quod est principale, et summum et velut principium et fons universi sensus." Accordingly, the Word of God would seem to be not only the Sermo Dei but also the Ratio Dei. Irenaeus distinctly disapproved of the Gnostic method of illustrating the eternal Word of God by the prolative or generated word of man (generationem prolativi hominum verbi), and attributing to Him just such another beginning and creation (II. 13. 8). The word *prolatio* (προβολή), used of the emission of aeons in the Gnostic system, had a Valentinian taint. Origen

[1] uno, cf. similimembrius (ὁμοιομερής) II. 13. 3.

protested against it[1]. But Justin used the expression προβληθὲν γέννημα[2]. Gregory Nazianzen calls the Father the προβολεύς of the Spirit[3]. But Irenaeus objected to it on account of its use in his day, writing, "He who speaks of the mind of God and ascribes to it a special origin (*prolationem*) of its own, makes God a compound being, implying that God is one thing and original mind another[4]."

The Philonic distinction of the Word as endiathetic (ἐνδιάθετος), conceived within, and the Word as (προφορικός) prophoric or uttered, the Word mental and the Word active, is also germane to the discussion. In II. 12. 5 Irenaeus refers to this distinction. This passage implies that the Gnostics held that the Word was prophoric. This expression was challenged by Clement of Alexandria[5]. Athanasius also treats this expression as inadequate, a word spoken being insubstantive[6]. On the other hand, the Word endiathetic, as Mr Harvey[7] points out, expresses the Platonism of Philo. One attribute seems, however, to correct the other, whereas used by themselves they involve Sabellianism or Arianism. Theophilus describes the Word as both endiathetic and prophoric[8],—compare also the terms immanent and transcendent as now used of Deity, one term serving to correct the other. The Arians in the

[1] *De Principiis*, IV. 28.
[2] *Tryph.* 62.
[3] *Orat.* 29. 2.
[4] II. 28. 5. See also II. 13. 10, per humanas has passiones transducentes eorum sensum, genesim et *prolaten* quinto loco Verbo Dei enarrantes. Cf. II. 14. 8, Verbi Dei genesim exponentes, et vitae, adhuc etiam sensus, et Dei emissiones obstetricantes.
[5] *Strom.* V. 547. "The Word of the universal Father is not the prophoric word, ὁ προφορικός, but the most manifest wisdom and goodness of God."
[6] *Orat.* II. 35.
[7] I. 278.
[8] *Ad Autol.* 10. 22.

first Sirmian Council, however, denied that He was either.

Accordingly, while treating our Lord's original and Divine existence with a profound reserve, Irenaeus would have acquiesced in Browning's words :

> I say the acknowledgment of God in Christ,
> Accepted by the reason, solves for thee
> All questions in the earth and out of it.

He was equally unflinching in his position regarding the humanity of our Lord. Boldly facing the problem connected with the Virgin-birth and the kenosis[1] of the Word, he declared that we are saved by His Incarnation. For " had our Lord's flesh not been of the same substance as ours, He had not summed up humanity in Himself, nor could He be called flesh. But the Father would have caused His composition to have been of a different substance. But now because it was man who had perished, this Word became the Author of our salvation, giving through Himself fellowship with Himself and the attainment of His salvation[2]." Cf. also V. 14. 1 : " Had He not been made flesh and blood according to the original formation, saving in Himself at the end what had been lost in the beginning in Adam, He had not recapitulated these things in Himself." Irenaeus allows that there was a difference between our humanity and His in this, that whereas we are sinners He was without sin ; but this difference, he maintains, was not one of substance. " For had His flesh been of a different substance from ours, that had not been reconciled to God which had been made

[1] Ritschl was inclined to despise kenotic theories, he styled them "pure mythology" (*R. und V.* III. 384—393). At the same time the mysterious self-limitation of Christ is more in accordance with Scripture, e.g. Phil. ii. 7 and 2 Cor. viii. 9, than are the sweeping assertions and denials of Ritschl.

[2] V. 14. 2.

hostile by transgression. But now through that connection of ours with Himself, the Lord has reconciled man to God the Father, reconciling us to Himself by the body of His flesh and redeeming us by His own blood, as the Apostle said in his letter to the Ephesians, 'in whom we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins.' And, indeed, in every letter the Apostle declares clearly that we are saved by the flesh and blood of our Lord[1]." These words, which recall the passage in *Saul*—

> 'Tis the weakness in strength that I cry for! my flesh that I seek
> In the Godhead. I seek and I find it. O Saul, it shall be
> A Face like my face that receives thee; a Man like to me
> Thou shalt love and be loved by for ever; a Hand like this hand
> Shall throw open the gates of new life to thee! See the Christ stand!

are gathered up in the concluding paragraph of the chapter in which he distinguishes this Flesh and Blood —the *Carnalis Adventus*, the Incarnation or perfect humanity of the Son of God—from the flesh and blood or carnal acts which cannot possess the kingdom of heaven, and enjoins us to confess that He is God, and to believe firmly in His humanity[2]. Again he writes[3]: "His righteous humanity (*justa caro*) reconciled that humanity which had been in bondage to sin, and brought it into friendship with God"; and "The Lord Who redeemed us by His blood, gave His soul for our soul and His flesh (σάρκα = humanity) for our flesh (humanity)[4].

That flesh was assumed in the womb of a Virgin. Irenaeus held the Virgin-birth strongly. In III. 16. 2 he says: "We have already shown from the words

[1] V. 14. 3.
[2] Deum confitens et hominem ejus firmiter excipiens (V. 14. 4).
[3] V. 14. 2.
[4] V. 1. 1.

of John that John knew one and the same Person was the Word of God and also the Only-Begotten, and that He became incarnate for our salvation, even Jesus Christ our Lord. But Matthew also recognizing that Jesus Christ was one and the same Person, setting forth His human generation which He had of the Virgin...says: 'The book of the generation of Jesus Christ, the Son of David.'...And so the promise made to the Fathers was fulfilled, the Son of God being born of a pure Virgin." Again he writes: "Emmanuel, Who is Virgin-born[1]"; and in III. 21. 4 he says that "the Holy Spirit signified by the words (Isaiah vii. 10—17), His generation from a Virgin, and His substance as God[2]; for the name Emmanuel signifies this."

He repeatedly argues against the notion that our Lord was the son of Joseph, and points out the care St Matthew took to guard against such a conclusion in III. 16. 2. In V. 1. 3, he says it was the Father of all "Who accomplished the Incarnation[3]"; but in III. 17. 4 he ascribes this work more immediately to the Holy Spirit, Who "descended according to the prearranged dispensation" (*οἰκονομίαν*); and in V. 1. 3 he describes the Holy Spirit coming upon Mary; so that we may compare with his expressions the phrase in the Proper Preface for Christmas Day—"Who by the operation of the Holy Ghost was made man."

From Mary our Lord took His humanity. "They are far astray," he writes, "who say that He took nothing from the Virgin, in order that they may get rid of His inheritance of the flesh and His likeness to

[1] III. 19. 1 and III. 21. 4.
[2] Here we have the Platonic distinction of *γένεσις* and *οὐσία*. Cf. also the *Homoousion*.
[3] qui operatus est incarnationem ejus.

us...For if He had not taken the substance of the flesh from man, He neither became man nor the Son of Man, and if He was not made what we are, there was nothing wonderful in His sufferings. Every one will allow that we consist of body, taken from the ground, and soul, receiving spirit from God, and such the Word of God became, recapitulating His own creation in Himself... Otherwise His coming down (*κάθοδος*) to Mary were superfluous. For why did He come down to her if He was to take nought from her? and if He took nought from Mary, He could not have received earthly food by which the earthly body is sustained, He had not felt hunger after fasting forty days, John had never said, 'Jesus sat, being wearied with his journey,' He had never wept over Lazarus, or sweated drops of blood; blood and water had never issued from His pierced side. For all these things are indications of the flesh which is taken from the earth and which He recapitulated in Himself, saving His own handiwork[1]." "Even if Jesus," he argues in III. 21. 9, "had been the son of Joseph by nature, he could not have been the heir of the royal line according to Jeremiah[2], for Joseph is represented by Matthew as the son of Joacim and Jechoniah, and Jechoniah and all his were cast out from the kingdom, and God said of his father Joacim, 'he will have none to succeed him on the throne of David.'" Irenaeus here helps to clear up a difficulty in the text. As Mr W. C. Allen[3] says, we must read[4] "Josias begat Joachim and his brethren, and Joachim begat Jechoniah." The more important manuscripts omit Joachim altogether. The

[1] III. 22. 2. [2] xxii. 28; xxxvi. 30.
[3] *Matthew*, Int. Crit. Com., p. 8.
[4] Mt. i. 11.

Variorum Bible notices the reading: "Josias begat Jakim and Jakim begat Jechonias."

In contrasting the work of the Second with that of the First Adam, he argues that as Adam "the protoplast" received his substance from the virgin soil, so the Word, born of Mary, still a virgin, summed up the generation of Adam which was saved by Him[1]. He also contrasts the obedience of the Virgin with the disobedience of Eve, the one counteracting the effect of the other. In a pointed passage he allows the antithesis to get the better of his doctrine, writing, "As by a Virgin our race was bound (*adstrictum*) to death, so by a Virgin it is freed" (*solvitur*), Virginal disobedience being balanced by Virginal obedience[2]. The reading *solvitur* is supported by the parallel passage in III. 22. 4, "quod alligavit virgo Eva per incredulitatem hoc virgo *solvit* per fidem." Would he have regarded the Virgin as carrying God Θεοφόρος, rather than Θεοτόκος, bearing God? See V. 19. 1, "ut portaret Deum obediens ejus verbo." He used the expression "to carry God" in a general sense. See V. 8. 1, where he writes: "we being gradually accustomed to hold and carry (*portare*) God."

The mode of the Incarnation was adapted to man's capacity. The Lord did not come to us as He could have come, but as we were able to behold Him[3]. God

[1] III. 21. 10. "protoplastus ille Adam." Cf. protoplasti peccatum (V. 19. 1).

[2] V. 19. 1. *salvatur*, is saved (Clerm. and Voss), is manifestly wrong, completely spoiling the antithesis which is intended. Merc. 1. reads *solvitur*, as Massuet points out. Augustine, *Contra Julianum* I. 3, quotes the whole passage and reads *salvatur*. This was probably the cause of the error. See also Augustine's reference to Irenaeus' statement of the sin of the protoplast by which we were bound, "quod protoplasti peccato fuimus tanquam vinculis alligati" (*ibid.* I. 7).

[3] IV. 28. 3.

could have created man perfect, but man, who was recently made, could not receive or retain perfection all at once. Accordingly, because of man's infancy, the Word of God became an infant like us (*συνενηπίαζεν*), not for His own sake, being perfect Himself, but on account of man. He came in that capacity in which man might be able to receive Him[1]. "He passed through the various ages of man, becoming an infant, for infants to sanctify infants; a child among children to sanctify such, giving them also an example of the effect of piety, righteousness and obedience; a youth among youths to sanctify them for the Lord; and an elder among elders[2], that he might be a perfect Master, not only in the exposition of the truth, but also in age, sanctifying the elders, and becoming an example for them also. Lastly he came even to death that he might be the first begotten from the dead, being the prince of life, before all things and preceding all men." Compare III. 18. 7, "He passed through every age, restoring to all communion with God."

It is the great merit of Ritschl that he emphasized the fact that the historical Christ brought the perfect revelation of God, so that no further revelation is conceivable. *R. und V.*, III. 367. The two grounds on which he affirms the divinity of Christ are His complete revelation of God's grace and truth, and His perfect supremacy over the world (cf. *Faith and Fact*, Edghill, p. 186).

But Irenaeus was well aware of the difficulties connected with the relation of the human to the Divine in the Son of Man. And he offers a solution in III. 19. 3, where he says: "For as He was man in order that He

[1] IV. 38. 2. [2] II. 22. 4.

might be subject to temptation; so was He Word that He might be glorified, the Word *remaining quiescent* (ἡσυχάζοντος) in His trial, humiliation, crucifixion, and death, but being present with (συγγινομένου) His humanity (τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ) in conquest, endurance, beneficence, resurrection and assumption."

He insists that the Christ is truly God and truly man. See I. 9. 3: "Learn, ye foolish, that Jesus, Who suffered for you, Who tabernacled among you, is the very Word of God." The phrase "*hypostatic union*," indeed, occurs in a fragment of an exposition of 2 Kings vi. 6 (the floating of the axe-head), where we read: "So the Word of God being united with the flesh, by a union natural and hypostatic (or essential) (ἑνώσει τῇ καθ' ὑπόστασιν φυσικῇ), that which was heavy and earthy was taken up into heaven by the Divine Nature[1]."

He also sets himself to answer the great question "Cur Deus homo?" In the first place, he says, the Word became flesh to reveal the Father. "The Word became the dispenser of the Father's grace for the advantage of man, revealing God to man and presenting man to God, and at the same time maintaining the

[1] Greek Frag. XXVI. Harvey ("by no means genuine," Harnack, *Hist. of Dog.* II. 280). ὑπόστασις is used of spiritual substance in I. 5. 4 and I. 11. 1; of the *substance* of the flesh which had lost the breath of life in V. 12. 3, and "our substance" is defined in V. 8. 1 as "animae et carnis adunatio"; in I. 15. 5 with οὐσία of the matter and substance of Deity. In V. 1. 1 ὑποστάσει ἀληθείας (in actual truth) is opposed to δοκήσει (appearance). In V. 13. 3 he says the transformation of our body will not be ἐξ ἰδίας ὑποστάσεως, due to its own substance or nature, but to the Divine working (κατὰ τὴν τοῦ κυρίου ἐνέργειαν). In a Greek Fragment (XIX. Harvey) Joshua is a type τοῦ ἐνυποστάτου Λόγου, the incarnate or the actual (materialized) Word. The word ὑπόστασις generally meant the Divine substance regarded personally. Athanasius, *Orat.* III. 65, used it as a synonym of οὐσία, and in IV. 1 with οὐσία, as subsistence. It does not appear to be used of person in Irenaeus.

invisibility of the Father lest man should at any time become a despiser of God, and in order that he should always have an ideal towards which he might advance. And again He revealed God (lit. made God visible) to man in many ways, lest man, altogether falling away from God, should cease to exist, for a living man is the glory of God, and the vision of God is the life of man[1]."

"The Incarnation of the Saviour," he writes, "would have been superfluous if man already knew the truth[2]," and equally so if the Father and the Son could not be known at all (IV. 6. 4). The Son was ever the Light of the world, for "all who from the beginning had knowledge of God and prophesied the advent of Christ received the revelation from the Son Himself" (IV. 7. 2). Abraham knowing the Father from the Word confessed Him as God (IV. 7. 1). "Jesus raised up children to Abraham from stones, delivering us from the worship of stones and from hard and fruitless thoughts, and creating in us a faith like to Abraham's. Accordingly, it is one and the same God who called Abraham, and gave him the promise. And He is the Maker, Who through Christ prepares the luminaries in the world, that is, those of the Gentiles who believe. Rightly then have we shown that He is known by no one but the Son, and to whomsoever the Son shall reveal Him. But the Son reveals the Father to all, by Whom He wishes to be known. Without the good will of the Father and the administration of the Son no one will know God" (IV. 7. 2). "It was for this reason that the Jews departed from God, through not accepting His Word but imagining that they could know the Father by Himself, without the Word, that is, without the Son,

[1] IV. 20. 7. [2] II. 14. 7.

ignoring Him Who in a human form spoke to Abraham" (IV. 7. 4). "His own Word alone knows the Father, Who is invisible, illimitable, and ineffable as far as we are concerned, and reveals Him to us. The Son reveals the knowledge of the Father by His manifestation, for the manifestation of the Son is the knowledge of the Father, and the Father Who alone knows the Word reveals Him. Through the Creation the Word reveals God the Creator; through the world, the Lord Who made it; through the thing formed, the artist Who formed it; and through the Son, the Father Who begat the Son...But through the Law and the Prophets, the Word preached alike of Himself and the Father. And through the Word Himself made visible and palpable, the Father was revealed, although all did not believe in Him. But all saw the Father in the Son. *For the Father is the invisible of the Son and the Son is the visible of the Father*[1]." "In no other way could we have learnt the things of God, had not the Master, existing as the Word, been made man. For no one else could have made known to us the things of the Father but the Father's own Word, Who is the Word of Power and very (*verus*) man[2]." The whole passage deserves consideration. Regarding the Father's revelation of the Son he writes: "Neither can any one know the Son without the goodwill of the Father" (IV. 6. 3). "And to this end the Father revealed the Son, that He may be manifested through Him to all, and may receive those righteous ones who believe in Him into incorruption and eternal bliss, for to believe in Him is to do His will. The Father has, therefore, revealed

[1] IV. 6. 3—6. [2] V. 1. 1.

Himself to all, by making His Word visible to all, and conversely the Word revealed both Father and Son to all, since He was seen by all[1]."

Incorruption is another gift that followed into humanity from the Incarnation. "Life does not come from us nor from our nature, but it is given according to the grace of God[2]." "As the flesh was made capable of corruption, it is also made capable of incorruption, and as of death so also of life[3]." In Old Testament times the friendship of God conferred immortality upon those who obtained it[4]. But in New Testament times this gift was held to come through the Word. "Had not man been joined to God (i.e. by the Incarnate Christ) he could have no share in incorruption" (III. 18. 6). In V. 2. 3 he shows how immortality and life are obtained from the Word of God, "Who giveth them (i.e. our bodies) resurrection, to the Glory of God the Father, Who really confers immortality upon the mortal, and gives as a free gift incorruption to the corruptible, because the power of God is made perfect in weakness, lest we should be puffed up, as having life of ourselves, and be exalted against God with ungrateful minds, but learning from experience that it is from His excellency and not from our nature that we have eternal duration, should neither miss the glory of God nor remain in ignorance of our own nature." "The Lord came to give life (ζωοποιῶν) to the substance of the flesh which had lost the breath of life, in order that as we all die in Adam, being psychical, we may live in Christ, becoming spiritual, not laying down the creation of God, but the desires of the flesh, and

[1] IV. 6. 5. [2] II. 34. 3. [3] V. 12. 1.
[4] Amicitia Dei immortalitatis condonatrix. IV. 13. 4.

receiving the Holy Spirit" (v. 12. 3). But the Holy Spirit is in this life our *earnest* of this incorruption. He is the Spirit Who giveth life (πνεῦμα ζωοποιοῦν), the Spirit who embraceth man within and without (περιλαβὸν ἔνδοθεν καὶ ἔξωθεν) since He abideth for ever and never leaveth him (v. 12. 2). "The psychical bodies die when they lose the soul, then *rising through the Spirit* they become spiritual bodies, so that through the Spirit they may always have an abiding life" (v. 7. 2). "But now we have obtained a certain measure of His Spirit, for our perfection and preparation for incorruption, becoming gradually accustomed to hold and carry God. This the Apostle called an *earnest* (ἀρραβών, Vg. *pignus*), that is, a part of that honour which has been promised to us by God...So then this *earnest* dwelling in us now makes us spiritual, and the mortal is absorbed in immortality, not by the loss of the flesh, but by the communion of the Spirit. For they were not without flesh, to whom he wrote, but they had received the Spirit of God in which we cry, 'Abba Father.' If therefore we now cry 'Abba Father' through the possession of the *earnest*, what will it be when rising from the dead we shall see Him face to face, when every member shall raise the hymn of exultation to Him Who raised them from the dead and gave them eternal life? For if the *earnest* embracing man in Himself (or, wrapping up man in Himself, complectens hominem in semetipsum), now causeth him to say 'Abba Father,' what will be the effect of the whole grace of the Spirit, which will be given to men by God? It will make us like Him and make man after the image and likeness of God" (v. 8. 1). The Spirit is thus the *earnest* of the immortal life which we have through Christ; and it is through

embracing that Spirit that man passes into the glory of the Father (IV. 20. 4). And God will be seen by men who bear (portant) His Spirit (IV. 20. 5).

In III. 19. 1 he writes: "For it was to this end that the Word of God became man, that man having been blended[1] with the Word and receiving the adoption, might become the son of God. There was no other way for man to attain unto incorruption and immortality. But how could we be joined to immortality and incorruption unless immortality and incorruption became what we are; so that the corruptible might be absorbed by incorruption and the mortal by immortality, and we might receive the adoption of sons?" Accordingly "the Son of God became the Son of Man—that through Him we might receive the adoption—the man (i.e. the humanity of Christ) bearing and containing and embracing the Son of God[2]." Irenaeus does not represent the Word or

[1] "Commixtus" is, as Harvey points out, an inaccurate version of *χωρήσας* and bears the taint of Eutychianism. However, Athanasius, *Orat.* IV. 33, speaks of the Word as blended with our nature (*καὶ ταύτῃ ἀνακραθείς*). The reference here seems to be to the fact already alluded to, that through the indwelling of the Spirit man becomes accustomed *capere* (=*χωρεῖν*) *et portare Deum*, V. 8. 1. Cf. IV. 20. 4 *complexus* homo Spiritum Dei in gloriam cedat Patris; V. 1. 3 perfectum hominem *capientem* perfectum Patrem; III. 20. 2 ad videndum Deum et capere Patrem. See also V. 19. 1 "Dominum *bajulante* (=*βαστάζοντος*) conditione quae bajulatur ab ipso."

[2] III. 16. 3, Filius Dei, Hominis Filius factus...*portante* homine et *capiente* et *complectente* Filium Dei. The reference here is evidently to the Incarnation and not to the union of man in general with God. This is proved by the Chiasmus: Filius Dei. Hominis Filius...homine...Filium Dei. Chiasmus is a favourite figure with the Latin translator, e.g.:

quod cogitat hoc et loquitur, et quod loquitur hoc et cogitat. II. 28. 5.
Apostolos interficientes et persequentes ecclesiam. IV. 28. 3.
terrenum spiritali et spiritali terrenum. II. 19. 4.
derideant doctrinam...illorum misereantur. I. 31. 3.
in carne assumptum, consumptam carnem. V. 5. 1.
emendat labem...maculam emundat. II. 4. 2.
hominem Spiritui, Spiritum in homine. V. 20. 2.
quicunque templum Dei violaverit violabit eum Deus. IV. 8. 3.
Deus bene facit, bene fit homini. IV. 11. 1. [These

Son of God as taking a second Personality, but a second Nature to Himself. His manhood had no personality of its own; its existence and completeness depended on the Divine Word. In an ideal way the union of humanity and divinity in Him is a type of our ultimate union with God, the same expression being used of both unions, e.g. capere, portare, complecti.

Irenaeus does not discuss the question whether there would have been an Incarnation if man had not sinned. But while making the revelation of the Father one great reason for the Incarnation, he could hardly be said to consider the Incarnation as independent of Adam's fall, for he says in one of his epigrammatic sentences, "as through the disobedience of one man sin entered and death ruled through sin, so righteousness introduced through the obedience of one Man may bear the fruit of life in those who were once dead[1]." Cf. the statement of Athanasius[2]: "The Son does not live by the gift of life, for He is life, and gives, not receives it." The outstanding result of the Incarnation was the new life that flowed into humanity through Christ. But another result equally emphasized was the redemption from the power of sin, which will be treated in the next chapter. Another equally prominent result was the restoration of the image and likeness of God, described in V. 16. 2[3]. In III. 20. 2, he used the phrase "imitatorem eum assignans Deo," which may mean sealing him as a follower of God.

The Incarnation, accordingly, is represented by

These are but a few of the many examples of this figure. See *Excursus*. See also V. 14. 4 "carnalem adventum Filii Dei et Deum confitens et *hominem* ejus excipiens."

[1] III. 21. 10. [2] *Orat.* III. 1.

[3] Also ascribed to the *universa Spiritus gratia*, V. 8. 1.

Irenaeus as fulfilling two supreme purposes with regard to the Father: (1) the revelation of His character and love to man, and (2) the realization of His original purpose in the creation of the race by the restoration of man to His image and likeness in the Son, which is incorruption and immortal life and sonship in the Father. He concludes the treatise with the words: "And he shall be made after the image and likeness of God[1]."

There may be apparent inconsistencies in Irenaeus' presentation of his doctrine of Christ[2]. But in v. 14. 4 he beseeches his very dear friend to acknowledge the advent of the Son of God in the flesh, both confessing His Godhead (*Deum*) and accepting[3] His Manhood (*hominem*). He may seem to keep distinct the office of the Word as the Revealer of the Father from that of the Son of God, the recapitulation of man. But the difference lies in the point of view. Christ is regarded more especially as the Word in His relation to the Father Whom He reveals, and more particularly as the Son in His relation to man, whom He came to make a son of God. Again, as the recapitulation of the race He is at once the starting-point of its development and the realization of its ideal, *Christus origo et consummator*, while as the Revealer of the Father He is the restorer of His image and likeness to man.

In one passage he describes the Incarnation as a revelation of the Paternal Light that illuminates our

[1] "Et fiet secundum imaginem et similitudinem Dei."

[2] Harnack, *Hist. of Dogma*, Eng. Trans. II. 262.

[3] hominem ejus *excipiens* v.l., *eum* for *ejus* in earlier editions. This latter reading would imply *expectation* of His second advent, excipiens representing ἐκδεχόμενος. This would correspond to IV. 20. 6, qui portent Spiritum ejus et semper adventum ejus sustinent.

manhood, writing: "so that the Paternal Light may fall upon the flesh of our Lord and be reflected in roseate hue from His flesh upon us, and so man may enter into incorruption surrounded by the Paternal Light[1]." But there is no tinge of the heresy afterwards known as Sabellianism in Irenaeus, for he did not regard the Son as merely a manifestation of the Father, much less is there any trace of the heresy afterwards known as Arianism, although he does quote the passage, Prov. viii. 22—25[2], which the Arians cited in support of their theory.

[1] IV. 20. 2. Cf. φῶς ἐκ φωτός.

[2] IV. 20. 2. Eusebius, *c. Marcellum de E. Th.* III. 2, points out that קָנָה (*kanah*) in Prov. viii. 22 is wrongly rendered ἔκτισε (creavit) by LXX. Theodotion translated it by ἐκτήσατο, Vulg. by possedit. In Gen. iv. 1 it denotes possession by parental generation and appears in the name Cain קַיִן.

CHAPTER X

THE INCARNATION AND THE ATONEMENT

IRENAEUS proceeds to show that the human life of the Incarnate Word, consummated by the crucifixion, confers salvation, freedom, and divinity upon man. The work of the Atonement is identified more or less with the progress and process of His Incarnate Life. Every act of that Life is regarded as of saving value, and the whole Life as a work of salvation. The knowledge of salvation is the knowledge of the Son of God, Who is both salvation and Saviour and that which saves[1]. "He is our Saviour, because He is the Son and the Word of God. He is saving, since He is Spirit, for it is written, 'The Spirit of our countenance is Christ the Lord[2],' and He is Salvation, inasmuch as He was flesh and dwelt among us."

Regarding the life of Jesus as possessed of saving efficacy, Irenaeus, on the one hand, outstripped the Apologists who chiefly regarded it as a fulfilment of prophecy and a revelation of reason, and, on the other hand, took a broader view than more recent theologians, who would confine saving grace to the Cross and Passion of our Lord. The Crucifixion marked for him the

[1] III. 10. 3. salus et Salvator et salutare.

[2] *Thren.* iv. 20. Heb. "the breath of our nostrils." LXX. "the Spirit of our face."

consummation of the Incarnation; but he did not restrict the work of the Atonement to the one transcendent episode in the Incarnate Life. Suffering and death were the ordinary lot of man, and therefore they were to be recapitulated, or experienced to the full, in the life of Him Who summed up all conditions of this mortal life in His. For "when He became incarnate in man, He summed up in Himself the long roll of humanity, supplying us in a concise manner with salvation, so that what we lost in Adam, namely, the being in the image and likeness of God, we might recover in Christ Jesus[1]." "He passed through every age to restore to all that communion with God[2]."

The suffering of Christ, however, must enter largely into that scheme of redemption in which an obedience unto death was manifested that in some mysterious way acted as an opposite principle to the disobedience of man. "And not only in the way just mentioned did the Lord reveal the Father and Himself to mankind, but also in His Passion. For by atoning for (dissolvens) that disobedience of man, originally shown in the case of a tree, He became obedient unto death, even the death of the Cross, healing the disobedience which arose in connection with one tree by that obedience which was displayed upon another[3]."

In one passage[4] he remarked: "Abraham in faith and obedience to the word of God offered up his only-begotten and beloved son with a ready will and gave

[1] III. 18. 1. *in compendio nobis salutem praestans*=συντόμως. Cf. compendii poculum (III. 16. 6), the cup that recapitulated or crowned his work, cf. *compendialiter*...ex aqua...factum est vinum (III. 11. 3), i.e. by a summary process. Cf. Clem. Alex. *Str.* v. 694, where he speaks of the saving power of the Word, ἡ ἰσχὺς τοῦ Λόγου ἡ δοθεῖσα ἡμῖν σύντομος οὖσα καὶ δυνατή, compendiosa et valida (concentrated and forceful).

[2] III. 18. 7. [3] V. 16. 3. [4] IV. 5. 4.

him as a sacrifice to God, that God might be pleased to present as a sacrifice for our redemption His beloved and Only-Begotten Son for all his seed." But, broadly speaking, in his analysis of the work of redemption, which he was one of the first of the Fathers to attempt, he represented the suffering of Christ, not as sacrificial or penal, but as real and recapitulative.

The efficacy of His work depended upon His having fulfilled the whole economy of human life[1], or upon His having passed through every age and condition of life[2]. In v. 17. 1 he does, indeed, speak of Christ as "having restored us by His Incarnation to friendship with God, on the one hand propitiating for us the Father against Whom we had sinned, having mitigated (consolatus) our disobedience by His obedience, and, on the other hand, giving us communion with and submission to our Maker." But there is little trace in Irenaeus of the ideas of *propitiatio* and *satisfactio* which his legal training helped Tertullian to formulate, and still less, as we shall see, of the theory of a ransom paid to the devil. He generally describes suffering and death as part and parcel of the lot of humanity which the Lord had summed up in Himself, in His recapitulation or summing up of the human race. Through our organic union with Him, His obedience, salvation and incorruptibility are ours; just as the sin and loss of Adam became the heritage of all mankind which had been represented by and summed up in him[3]. "And recapitulating universal

[1] III. 17. 4. *πᾶσαν τὴν κατὰ ἄνθρωπον οἰκονομίαν ἐκπληρώσαντος.*

[2] II. 22. 4. Omnem aetatem sanctificans per illam quae ad ipsum erat similitudinem.

[3] Several passages in the treatise bear upon this *recapitulatio*, e.g. suum plasma in semetipsum recapitulans (III. 22. 1); and ita recapitulans in se Adam ipse Verbum existens, ex Maria quae adhuc virgo, recte accipiebat *generationem Adae recapitulationis*" (III. 21. 10). The last three words

humanity in Himself from the beginning to the end, he also recapitulated their death" (v. 23. 2, cf. III. 21. 10); "that as through a beaten man our race descended to death, through a victorious man we may ascend to life" (v. 21. 1); and "*in* the second Adam we are reconciled, having been made obedient unto death, to Him Whom we offended *in* the first Adam through disobedience" (v. 16. 2).

Sin is to a certain extent kept in the background. Death and life are the absorbing themes. "We cannot say," remarks Böhringer[1], "that Irenaeus, in making Adam's conduct and suffering apply to the whole human race, had started from an inward, immediate experience of human sinfulness and a feeling of the need of salvation founded on this." There is something, too, in the statement of Dr Harnack[2] that Irenaeus employed the thoughts of Paul "without having had the same feeling about the flesh and sin as that Apostle." It was St Paul's intense sense of his own crime against Christ before his conversion, and his rabbinical training, that gave motive and form respectively to his doctrine of sin. Augustine, in his burning consciousness of his own guilt and of the purity of Christ, and in his speculative transcendentalism, is the follower of St Paul. But Irenaeus is of the school of St John. He did not approach the subject from the same standpoint, or with the same depth of feeling and passionate intensity as Augustine, because he had not passed through the same terrible experience. Sin, however, is treated in a rational and religious

present a difficulty. Do they mean "the generation of Adam which He (the Word) recapitulated" or "the generation which was recapitulated in Adam"? The latter seems more suitable to the context, which sets forth the contrast between Adam and Christ.

[1] *Die Kirche Christi*, p. 484.

[2] *Hist. of Dogma*, II. 274 (Eng. Trans.).

manner by him. To resist God and to prove ungrateful to Him is to injure His handiwork and to lose one's life, "simul et artem ejus et vitam amisisti" (IV. 39. 2). He quotes with approval the words of an elder who said that "we ought not to censure the men of old time, but should ourselves fear lest by chance doing anything displeasing to God, after coming to the knowledge of Christ, *post agnitionem Christi*, we have no longer remission of sins" (IV. 27. 2).

Sin in this system is, accordingly, a thing to be reckoned with, being in all men by reason of their organic union with Adam. Sin is an unnatural thing that must be annihilated, and a disease that must be healed, while, at the same time, it serves a disciplinary purpose. For "how could man have the discipline of what is good unless he knew the opposite[1]?" He does not regard sin from a religiously emotional but rather from an intellectually moral point of view. "To obey God, to believe in Him and to guard His precept," he calmly wrote, "is good, this is the life of man. But not to obey Him is evil, and this is his death. Therefore, by the kindness of God man knows the good of obedience and the evil of disobedience[1]."

In V. 17. 1 sin is described as a debt to God, Whose debtors we are[2]. "Disobedience to God brought death upon man. Therefore, from the time they were handed over to it, they were made debtors of death[3]." But death is emptied of its sting by Christ Who gave man

[1] IV. 39. 1.

[2] hic est Pater noster cujus eramus debitores transgressi ejus praeceptum. Cf. V. 16. 3, neque enim alteri cuidam eramus debitores, cujus et praeceptum transgressi fueramus ab initio.

[3] V. 23. 1 debitores mortis effecti...facti sunt debitores mortis (V. 23. 2). Irenaeus does not regard man as a debtor to the devil but to death and to God (see above).

life, "for the salvation of man is the destruction of death[1]" (illius enim salus evacuatio est mortis). This is after 1 Cor. xv. 6, Irenaeus reading *evacuatur* mors (Vg. destruetur), which means that death is emptied of its power and robbed of its possession. In a previous chapter (III. 23. 1) he had explained this "evacuation" of death: evacuavit mortem vivificans eum hominem qui fuerat mortificatus. In similar terms he describes our Lord's conquest of the devil, as debtors to whom he does not regard us. For he writes: "per hominem recurrentem ad Deum *evacuetur* apostasia ejus" (v. 24. 3). Our debt to death was paid by Him Who recapitulated the death of man in Himself (v. 23. 2). "The Lord Himself having become the First-Begotten of the dead, received into His bosom the ancient fathers, and regenerated them into the life of God, He Himself becoming the beginning of the living (initium viventium)[2]." "On the day in which Adam died for disobedience to God, recapitulating this day in Himself, the Lord endured death in obedience to the Father[3]." "He Who died for man was made in the likeness of the flesh of sin that He might condemn sin, and cast it, as a thing already condemned, out of the flesh, but might incite man to attain to His likeness[4]."

These passages emphasize the reality of sin and its condemnation and conquest in the Passion of our Lord, but Irenaeus was more concerned to show that the sufferings of Jesus were real, not imaginary, as the Gnostics held. "Otherwise," he remarks[5], "there were no Passion, and we have been deceived by Him Who exhorts us to endure what He did not endure Himself.

[1] III. 23. 7. [2] III. 22. 4. [3] V. 23. 1.
[4] III. 20. 2. [5] III. 18. 6.

We, too, shall be superior to the Master by suffering and bearing what He never suffered nor bore. But as our Lord alone is truly Master, the Son of God is truly good and capable of suffering, even the Word of God the Father, Who was made the Son of man. For He agonized and conquered. As a man He was contending on behalf of the fathers, and through His obedience He discharged[1] the debt of disobedience; for He bound the strong man, set free the weak, and gave salvation to His own creation by destroying sin. For He is a most holy and merciful Lord, and one Who loveth the race of men. Therefore, as we have said, He caused human nature to cling to God and to be one with God. For had not man vanquished the enemy of man, that enemy had not been justly[2] vanquished; and had not God given salvation, we had never possessed it securely; and had not man been joined to God, he could never have shared in incorruptibility." He continues: "They who do not believe in a real incarnation, are still under the old condemnation, and are patrons[3] of sin, not believing in the conquest of death. But when the law, given by Moses, came and testified concerning sin, that there is a sinner, it took his kingdom from him, revealed him as a robber and murderer and not a king, but laid a burden upon man who had sin in himself, showing him to be worthy of death. But as the law is spiritual, it only caused the sin to be apparent, but did not remove it. For sin had no power over the Spirit, but only over the man. It therefore behoved Him Who assayed to slay sin and to redeem man, who was guilty of death,

[1] *persolvens*, see below. διαλύων (Harvey).
[2] δικαίως, see below.
[3] advocationem praebentes.

to become that very thing which he was, that is, man ; who had been drawn into bondage by sin, and was held fast by death, so that sin should be destroyed by man and man should go forth from death[1]." In this eloquent passage Christ is described as victorious through sufferings, as having achieved man's release from the bondage of sin, which is treated in a truly realistic way, by His obedience as very man, and as having destroyed sin and death in His own Incarnate life.

In an interesting chapter of the Third Book he somewhat palliates the disobedience of Adam, and allows that there were extenuating circumstances and that God took pity on him and saved him[2]. They are not trustworthy, according to him, who, like Tatian, "the first to invent this foolish idea," deny the salvation of Adam, quoting the text "In Adam all die," but ignoring that "where sin abounded grace did much more abound." "Such make themselves patrons of the serpent and of death[3]." He argues that it would have betokened the superiority of evil if God had abandoned man to death, whereas He showed His invincible power and merciful nature in the *reproof of* (*one*) *man*[4] and the *probation of all men*, who, like the vessels (*vasa*) of the strong man, were seized by the stronger, Adam being the first vessel in the possession of the former[5].

He seems to regard man's experience in the garden of innocence as an awakening of his conscience, and the knowledge of evil as necessary to the education and

[1] Cf. v. 1. 2 sq.

[2] III. 23. 1, owing to the deceit of the devil (praevaricationem inique inferens ei et per occasionem (=προφάσει, on the plea of) immortalitatis mortificationem faciens in eum).

[3] III. 23. 8, advocatos=προστάτας.

[4] ad correptionem (v.l. correctionem) hominis et *probationem* omnium.

[5] III. 23. 1. See Mt. xii. 29 σκεύη, Lk. xi. 22 σκῦλα, spolia.

training of man. "For how could man have received discipline in what is good, if he had no knowledge of the contrary?" But the Divine intention was, that "man learning by experience that it is an evil thing which robs him of life, that is, disobedience to God, may never attempt it at all, but knowing that what preserves his life, that is, obedience, is good, may diligently maintain it[1]." "The discipline," he proceeds to say, "consists in the knowledge of both good and evil, and its object is that man may choose the better." So the original destiny of man was in no wise hindered by the Fall. The fact was that the Fall became the means of leading men to attain the perfection for which they were destined. "Such," he remarks, "was the magnanimity of God that man, passing through every experience and obtaining the knowledge of morality (or moral discipline), and then coming to the resurrection from the dead, and learning by experience from whence he obtained deliverance, should ever be grateful to God, from Whom he received the gift of incorruption, and so might love Him more[2]."

Sin is treated as a disease in the same passage. "As the skill of the physician," he writes, "is proved by his patient, God is manifested in the case of man." From this point of view the work of Christ is a healing, being the removal of the corruption which disobedience entailed upon our nature, and which ends in death. In v. 17. 1 His obedience is a mitigation (consolatus est) of our disobedience; and in v. 16. 3, a healing (sanans) of it. It was as Creator that our Lord had this healing power over the constitution of man, which had been impaired by the inroad of evil. "And He restored man sound

[1] IV. 39. 1. [2] III. 20. 2.

and whole, preparing him to be perfect for Himself and the resurrection" (v. 12. 6). In this passage he treats the healing of the limbs as not only a type but also as an earnest of their salvation, saying, "Wherefore did He cure the members of the body and restore them to their former condition if they were not to be saved? As the fatal principle was the disobedience of one man, the healing principle was the righteousness introduced by the obedience of Christ into humanity, which was productive of life" (*vitam fructificat*) (III. 21. 10). In v. 17. 1 he again traces the connection between sin and disease. "His Word rightly said to the man (the paralytic): 'Thy sins be forgiven thee'...for paralysis is a result of sin. By remitting sins, He, indeed, healed men and manifested His own personality." But sin is not to be allowed to remain for ever in the nature of man, it must be eradicated ere the race can be reformed; ere the man can be remade in the likeness of God, and can become an imitator of God, and accept the paternal rule for seeing God and receiving the Father. Therefore "He Who died for man, was made in the likeness of sinful flesh, that He might condemn sin, and cast it as a guilty thing out of the flesh[1]." A strong expression "that He might slay sin" is found in III. 18. 7.

The restoration of man's fallen nature was, then, one great purpose of the Incarnation. But it would seem that the phrase in the Preface of Book v., "The Word of God became what we are that He might make us what He is," factus est quod sumus nos, uti nos perficeret esse quod et ipse, unless rhetorical, implies something more than restoration, and is to be paralleled

[1] III. 20. 2.

by the passage in Athanasius—"He was not man, and then became God, but He was God and then became man, and that to make us gods[1]," and "We men are made gods by the Word, as being joined to Him through His flesh[2]," etc. Cf. IV. 38. 4 "We blame Him because He did not make us gods from the first, but first men and then gods" (primo homines tunc demum dii). These passages are startling to our moral sense and use owing perhaps to the very vivid sense of the sonship of God possessed by the early Christians. But what they really mean is that the Word of God revealed the divinity of man, which He made possible by His Incarnation.

In the fifth book of the Treatise, he develops his theory of the Redemption, pointing out that the redemption of man from the kingdom of evil, that concentration of error and malignity which is called the *Apostasia*[3], is the preliminary process in the restoration of man. There is no trace, however, of Origen's idea that a ransom was paid by way of compensation to the Evil One by the Saviour—an error in which Gregory of Nyssa and Gregory the Great were drawn by the speculations of Origen. For he did not regard the Evil One as having a claim over the human race, or the Atonement as being a transaction between God and the Evil One. The debt which was owed, but which Christ did not owe, was to the eternal law of holiness. And, therefore, our redemption was effected by per-

[1] *Orat.* I. 39. ἡμᾶς θεοποιήσῃ...διὰ τοῦ Λόγου νἱοποιήθησαν καὶ ἐθεοποιήθησαν.

[2] *Orat.* III. 34. θεοποιούμεθα προσληφθέντες διὰ τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ. Cf. also Tertullian *adv. Prax.* 13 "si homines per fidem filios Dei factos deos scriptura pronuntiare non timuit"; also Hippolytus *Ph.* X. γέγονας γὰρ θεός...θεοποιηθῆς ἀθάνατος γεννηθείς.

[3] Cf. initium et materiam apostasiae suae habens hominem (III. 23. 8).

suasion (*secundum suadelam*), not by force (*cum vi*), the captives of sin being drawn out of its sphere and power by the spiritual attraction of the Christ, the Incarnate Word.

The principal passages on the *Apostasia* and the Redemption are v. 1. 1 and v. 21. 3. The *suadela* or moral influence by which man is drawn out of the tyranny of the *Apostasia*, the kingdom of evil, consists in the example of perfect obedience to the moral government of the Father in the Son, Who recapitulated humanity in Himself, and the illustration of the Father's love and mercy in the Word, Who revealed God in Himself. The key of this theory of redemption is the passage v. 1. 1 : "The Lord redeemed us with His own blood, and gave His soul for our soul, and His flesh for our flesh, and poured out the Spirit of the Father upon the union and communion of God and man, bringing God down to man and lifting man up to God by His Incarnation, and bestowing upon us immortality in a real and enduring sense at His Advent[1]."

There was a battle with evil and it was fairly contested. "For had not man conquered the antagonist of man, the enemy had not been justly (δικαίως) vanquished" (III. 18. 6). Cf. v. 21. 3 "He is *justly* led captive who took man captive *unjustly*." Very favourably do these statements compare with the statements to be found in many of the Church writers on this subject. Origen[2] asks: "To whom did He give His soul a ransom? It could not be to God; was it not therefore to the devil? For the devil held sway over us until

[1] v. 1. 1.
[2] *Comm. on Mt.* (vol. 16, c. 8).

there should be given to him the ransom on our behalf, namely the soul of Jesus—to him, I say, *who was deceived* into supposing that he could hold sway over it." Gregory of Nyssa[1] says, "The devil deceived in order to destroy. But He who is righteous and good employed the device of deceit (*τῇ ἐπινοίᾳ τῆς ἀπάτης*), benefiting not only that which was destroyed but also the destroyer[2]." Augustine seems to have had this view before him, although he did not identify himself with it, when he wrote[3], "the unjust one dealt against us, as it were, by just right (*aequo jure*), but our Lord, having been slain in His innocence, conquered him by a most just right" (*jure aequissimo*). He also says in the same treatise[4] that "the devil was conquered by the righteousness of Jesus Christ, because, although he found nothing worthy of death in him, he nevertheless slew him. Hence it was just that the debtors whom the devil was holding should be released, by believing in Him Whom the devil slew without any debt. The devil was conquered by Christ by *justice* (*justitia*), *not by power*." This is the very same thought as that of Irenaeus, "had not man conquered the antagonist of man, the enemy had not been justly vanquished" (*οὐκ ἂν δικαίως ἐνικήθη ὁ ἐχθρός*, III. 18. 6), and, "the Word of God powerful in all things and constant in His justice dealt justly even with the apostasy, redeeming His own

[1] *Orat. ad Catech.* 26. This theory that the devil was deceived was carried to extreme lengths by those who described our Lord's humanity as a bait that concealed the "hook" of His divinity to catch the devil (Gregory the Great, *Moralia in Job*, III. 569); or the cross as a "*mouse-trap*," baited by our Lord's blood (Peter Lombard, *Sent.* III. 19. 1). It was also described as an "emetic."

[2] Both Origen and Gregory believed in the ultimate salvation of the Devil.

[3] *De Trinitate* IV. 13.

[4] *Ibid.* XIII. 15.

therefrom, not by violence (*non cum vi*) whereby the Apostasy had originally gained its mastery over us, *greedily grasping at what was not its own*, but by moral force (*sed secundum suadelam*), as it became God to recover by persuasion rather than by violence what He sought" (v. 1. 1). Augustine also remarked that Christ observed this Divine propriety, and the Divine order, in which justice takes precedence of power, by postponing the exercise of His power until He had done what He ought[1]. We may compare with Irenaeus' allusion to the grasping nature of the devil, *ea quae non erant sua insatiabiliter rapiens*, the opinion of Augustine that the devil lost his rights over mankind by overstepping them. See also Leo's remark, *per injustitiam plus petendi totius debiti summa vacuatur*[2]. Irenaeus did not, however, hold the opinion that a ransom was paid to the devil by Christ, which was so scathingly condemned by Gregory Nazianzen[3] in the words, φεῦ τῆς ὕβρεως, "shame on the insult!" He does, indeed, say that "our Lord recovered His own *juste et benigne*, *juste* with reference to the apostasy from which He redeemed us by His own blood, *benigne*[4] with reference to ourselves who were redeemed" (v. 2. 1). He also said, "the Lord redeeming us with His own blood, giving His soul for our soul, and His flesh for our flesh" (v. 1. 1).

Although we have here the seeds of thought which might plausibly be developed into a systematic doctrine of compensation, like Origen's, Irenaeus had no idea of compensation at all. He regarded man as having fallen, through his own disobedience and of his own free will,

[1] postposuit quod potuit ut prius ageret quod oportuit (*De Trinitate* XIII. 14).
[2] Leo the Great 390—461, *Serm.* XXII. c. 4.
[3] *Orat.* 45.
[4] Cf. *secundum suadelam.*

albeit deceived, under the thraldom and tyranny of the devil, which he called "the apostasy," and from that apostasy he could be delivered, not by any violent procedure against either devil or man, not by any compensation or inducement[1] offered to the devil, but by persuading men of their free will to abandon the devil and sin. The human race did not belong originally to the devil: it had been seized by him, who held his possessions by force. It would not, however, be in keeping with the Divine character of justice and kindness to descend to the same level as the devil, and recover His own by force. The power of the devil over humanity had to be broken by man if the victory was to be a moral one; if man was to be induced of his own free will to abandon the devil and to allow himself to be fashioned anew in the image and likeness of God. That power was crushed by the obedience of Him Who "recapitulated in Himself the ancient enmity against the serpent and destroyed our adversary by means of the words of the Law, and the precept of the Father which He used for the destruction and *exposure* (*traductionem*[2]) of the apostate angel." The result of this victory was that Satan was conquered, proved to be an apostate, and bound in the same bonds by which he had bound man; while his power was overthrown and he himself made subject to man, not by any payment or compensation but by man's return to God, *per hominem*

[1] Oxenham, *Catholic Doct. of Atonement*, p. 132, explains *secundum suadelam* as "by a method which convinced Satan his rights were at an end." Neander, *Church Hist.* II. 383, so understands it. But Dorner, *Person of Christ* I. 479, rightly regards it as "by persuading men." Otherwise we lose the contrast of the devil's treatment of man (*cum vi*) and God's *secundum suadelam* which corresponds to *benigne* in V. 2. 1, quantum autem ad nos, qui redempti sumus, *benigne*; and *secundum misericordiam* Dei Patris (V. 21. 3).

[2] V. 21. 2. See whole chapter.

recurrentem ad Deum. On the other hand, man was freed, "for the binding of Satan was his emancipation," and he was renewed in the image and likeness of God[1]. The victory was, accordingly, both moral, spiritual, and complete. It was gained by One Who recapitulated universal humanity in Himself, and, therefore, its fruits are for universal humanity. That recapitulation meant the *death* of sin, the *annihilation* of death and the vivification of man (ut occideret quidem peccatum, evacuaret autem mortem et vivificaret hominem, III. 18. 7)[2].

It cannot, therefore, be said that Irenaeus put forward a doctrine of "compensation" similar to that of Origen. But it is not equally clear that he did not hold a position somewhat approaching that of Anselm[3] on "satisfaction." He does not, indeed, allude to any antagonism between the Father and the Son expressed in or removed by the Atonement. He does not, indeed, insist on either compensation or satisfaction in the usually applied sense. The spiritual union of the Father and the Son was for him the living basis of the Atonement, on which its possibility and practicability rested. By the Son's obedience the law of holiness was fulfilled. It was to the law that compensation was given and satisfaction made. As Athanasius well phrased it: "it was due to God's constancy that His law of holiness should be maintained[4]." But the obedience of Christ is described not only as a healing of our disobedience (see above),

[1] destruens adversarium nostrum et perficiens hominem secundum imaginem et similitudinem Dei, v. 21. 2.

[2] Cf. III. 18. 7 qui inciperet occidere peccatum et mortis reum redimere hominem...ut peccatum ab homine interficeretur et homo exiret a morte.

[3] *Cur Deus Homo*, I. 13. *necesse est ergo, ut aut ablatus honor solvatur aut poena sequatur.*

[4] *De Incarn.* 7.

but also in terms which may suggest and did most probably suggest the discharge of a debt which was owed to God. In III. 18. 6 "per obedientiam inobedientiam *persolvens*," and in V. 16. 3 "*dissolvens* eam inobedientiam" and "*exsolvere* inobedientiam," are expressions which, while capable of the rendering "dissolve" or "loose the knot of," might easily imply the payment of a debt in full to God, "for to no one else are we debtors but to Him Whose law we broke from the beginning" (V. 17. 1), i.e. the debt of honour, reverence and obedience which had to be paid. This would be the very principle laid down by Anselm (I. 13), "necesse est ergo ut ablatus honor solvatur"; which might be rendered, having regard to the feudalism of his age, "*homage* must be paid."

The relation of our Lord's obedience to our disobedience is expressed in a pregnant phrase in V. 19. 1, "recapitulationem ejus quae in ligno fuit inobedientiae, per eam quae in ligno est obedientiam, facientem," which implies that our disobedience was swallowed up and neutralized in Him, Who identified Himself with our case, by His own obedience. In another passage (V. 17. 1) the effect of His obedience upon our disobedience is expressed by the word *consolatus*, which implies mitigation or alleviation. It is the effect of His obedience not upon God in averting His wrath but upon our disobedience that is the chief concern of Irenaeus. And yet he says, "In this way the Father against whom we had sinned was propitiated" (V. 17. 1). That this propitiation did not involve the penalty or sacrifice of death, in the ordinary acceptation of the term, is shown by the passage in the conclusion of his exposition of the Temptation, "vanquishing him then the

third time He repulsed him," "et soluta est ea quae fuerat in Adam praecepti Dei praevaricatio[1], per praeceptum legis quod servavit Filius hominis, non transgrediens praeceptum Dei," that is, the disobedience of Adam was done away[2] by the obedience of Christ in the Temptation (v. 21. 2). That obedience was consummated on the cross, that "as we were made debtors to God by one tree, we may receive remission of our debt by another" (v. 17. 3). That spirit of obedience, that would prefer death to disobedience, was made ours, for "in the second Adam we have been reconciled, having been made obedient unto death" (v. 16. 2).

One fundamental difference between Irenaeus and Anselm is seen in the manner in which the Death of Christ is treated in their respective systems. As we have seen, the former regarded that Death as the consummation of His obedience to God, which, as displayed in the Temptation, had already atoned for the sin of Adam, the crowning act in His recapitulation of our

[1] *Praevaricatio* implies dishonesty and trickery and is very descriptive of Adam's conduct in the whole transaction. Praevaricatio is defined by Ulpian: "p. est ejus qui falsas rei excusationes admittit," that is, collusion. It has been suggested that the passage means, "the injury done to the law by Adam was set right by the obedience of Christ" (see Oxenham, op. cit. p. 133). It has this sense in III. 23. 1 "Adam, quem (serpens) tenebat, *praevaricationem* inique inferens ei, et per occasionem immortalitatis mortificationem faciens in eum," where p. implies that the devil pretended to be acting for man, while betraying him. Cf. IV. 27. 2 plebis praevaricationes = transgressions.

[2] soluta est. This is a remarkable statement. Solvere does not necessarily mean "pay for" (Oxenham) here. Cf. *solvit errorem* of the Passion of Christ (II. 20. 2), and *seductione illa soluta* (v. 19. 1). The idea is that of loosing a knot. Cf. III. 22. 4 "Quod alligavit Eva...Maria *solvit*." In the light of this and a similar passage, v. 19. 1, and Justin Martyr's words (*Dial.* p. 327), "that through the way the disobedience had its beginning, through the same it might have an end (κατάλυσιν)," one might render solvere as "quash" or "reverse." But Irenaeus also used a metaphor which, though probably intended to express "reversal," might suggest "satisfaction," viz. "aequa lance disposita virginalis inobedientia per virginalem obedientiam" (v. 19. 1).

humanity, whereas Anselm separated that Death from the Life that preceded it. In *Cur Deus Homo*, II. 11, he says, "He, as every rational creature, owed obedience to God, but He did not owe His death, having never sinned. Therefore He gives His death freely and not as a debt." On the other hand, Irenaeus did not look upon that death as "a payment to God exceeding the debt" (Anselm II. 20), giving God "a complete satisfaction" and enabling Him "to proceed with His work for humanity" (*ibid.* II. 4), but as the destruction, the *evacuation* of death, the deliverance of man from its terror, and the payment of the debt of death for the race which discharged its debt in Him. Anselm did not, as Irenaeus, see man in Christ and Christ in man. Christ's union with our race in Irenaeus is mystical and eternal, being based on the recapitulation of humanity by the Word of God; in Anselm it is accidental and external. Another great difference lies in the relation in which the Father and the Son are represented as standing to One Another in regard to the redemption of mankind. This relation in Anselm is represented as forensic, mechanical, and external. But in Irenaeus the manner in which the Father and the Son cooperate in the Atonement, reveals a spiritual intimacy and a mystical union between these Divine Persons.

According to Irenaeus mercy was the motive of the Atonement, a Father's pity for those who had abandoned His ways. "And man, who had been before a captive, is drawn out from the power of his master *according to the mercy of God the Father*[1], Who had compassion on His creatures and gave them salvation and renewed

[1] secundum misericordiam Dei Patris. Cf. II. 20. 2 haec ergo fuit magnanimitas Dei.

them through the Word, that is, through Christ, so that man may learn by experience that he has not incorruption as his own possession but that it is the gift of God[1]." "Man who was disobedient to God and was cast down from immortality, then obtained mercy through the Son of God receiving the adoption which is through Him[2]." Athanasius has a corresponding phrase, "according to the loving-kindness and goodness of His own Father, on account of our salvation[3]." While there is nothing in Irenaeus to show that he contemplated the views of equivalent punishment and imputed righteousness that were afterwards formulated by Calvin, there is some indication of the doctrine of vicarious suffering in the passage, "He Who suffered and shed His blood for us is Christ the Son of God, Who *by His passion reconciled us to God*[4]." "The fruit of that Passion was fortitude and virtue" (istius passio fructificavit fortitudinem et virtutem). "By His Passion our Lord destroyed death, abolished error, banished corruption, and removed ignorance, but manifested life, displayed the truth and conferred immortality[5]." Payment of a penalty is not connected with that Passion by Irenaeus.

[1] donatione Dei accipit incorruptelam, v. 21. 3. Cf. *ζωὴν χαρισάμενος ἀφθαρσίαν δωρήσηται*, I. 10. 1, giving life as an act of grace bestows incorruption as a gift (of the Spirit). Salvation is not of fate or of necessity but of grace.

[2] A comment of Rom. xi. 32.

[3] *κατὰ φιλανθρωπίαν καὶ ἀγαθότητα τοῦ ἑαυτοῦ Πατρὸς διὰ τὴν ἡμῶν σωτηρίαν* (*De Incar.* I.).

[4] III. 16. 9.

[5] II. 20. 2. A difficult expression occurs here "noster Christus passus est passionem validam et quae non *cederet*" (Ar., Voss., Massuet; *accederet* for accideret, Clerm., Harvey). The latter compares Greek *οὐ τυχόν*—no ordinary passion. The meaning required by context is "a passion that would not lead to His own corruption." This would be expressed by cui non cederet, "to which he would not yield." Could it possibly mean "which might have no increase" (accessio = attack of sickness)?

Furthermore, that aspect of the Atonement known as Reconciliation is presented in no narrow or forensic sense. It is a reconciliation accomplished not only *for us* but also *in us*, a reconciliation between man and God. "For the Word of God dwelt in man and became the Son of Man that He might accustom man to receive God, and accustom God to dwell in man, according to His Father's pleasure[1]." This reconciliation is based upon the reality of the Saviour's humanity—His Incarnation. "Should anyone say," he remarks, "that the flesh of our Lord differed in this respect from us that it was sinless, and we are sinners, he speaks the truth. But if he imputes a different kind of flesh to our Lord, the doctrine of reconciliation will not square with his theory. For that is reconciled which was previously hostile. Had our Lord taken flesh of a different substance, that which had been estranged through transgression has not been reconciled to God. But now by our organic relation with Him[2], the Lord reconciled man to God the Father, reconciling us to Himself through the body of His own flesh, and redeeming us by His blood." Again he writes in III. 16. 9: "By His Passion one and the same Christ Jesus, the Son of God, reconciled us to God," in order to impress upon his readers the fact that Jesus was really human as well as Divine, both Christ and Word, Who summing up human nature in His own Person saved it, and reconciling man to God in His own Person made the Atonement. "For had He been incarnate for another purpose, and of a different substance, He had not gathered up humanity in Himself and could not be said to be flesh. But now

[1] III. 20. 2.

[2] V. 14. 3. per eam quae est ad se communicationem.

because He became that which perished, namely, man, this Word has been able to confer salvation, bringing about by His own self communion with Him and making an effectual demand for his (man's) salvation[1]. It was His righteous flesh that reconciled that flesh which was detained in sin, and brought it into friendship with God."

It is because of this organic union with or recapitulation of humanity, that Irenaeus seems to include a bloody death in the economy of the Incarnation. In v. 14. 1 he writes: "When our Lord said: 'All the righteous blood which is shed upon the earth, from the blood of righteous Abel to the blood of Zacharias...will be required,' he implied that there would be a recapitulation of all the shedding of the blood of righteous men and prophets in Himself, and that this requisition of blood would be made by Himself. For this blood would not be required unless it could be saved, nor could the Lord have recapitulated these things in Himself, unless He had been made flesh and blood according to the original formation, saving in Himself that which had been lost at the beginning in Adam." But, generally speaking, he signifies by the blood of Christ the reality of His Manhood. He returns to this thought in a following section, v. 14. 3, where he writes: "Remembering then, dearly beloved, that you have been redeemed by the flesh of our Lord and restored by His blood, and 'holding the head from which the whole body of the Church welded together increaseth,' that is, the Incarnation of the Son of God[2], and confessing His Deity and

[1] v. 14. 2. per eam quae esset ad eum communionem, et *exquisitionem* salutis ejus efficiens. This is to be explained by Lk. xi. 50, *exquiretur* omnis sanguis justus qui effunditur, etc., which is quoted just before.

[2] carnalem adventum Filii Dei.

believing in His Manhood, you will easily confute the later opinions of the heretics by these Scripture proofs."

The flesh and blood, or the Incarnation of the Son of God, is thus the means of communion between God and man, and restores the ideal relations that should exist between the Maker and the man[1]. And thus God was revealed to man and man was presented to God; and the harmony of creation was restored. "For it behoved the Mediator between man and God, by reason of His relationship with both, to lead both into friendship and concord, to present man to God and to make known God to man[2]." "He needs nothing from us, but we need communion with Him, and, therefore, He shed Himself graciously upon us that He might gather us into the bosom of the Father" (v. 2. 1).

In this new union with Christ, real and spiritual, and specialized in the Eucharist, our blood is nourished by His blood and our body by His body[3], and, by the union of God and man, man is made partaker of the incorruptibility of God[4]. And His obedience is ours. For in Christ, the second Adam, we are reconciled, being made obedient unto death[5]. This obedience, as we have already seen, was an important factor in the reconciliation. "The Lord," he says, "restored us to friendship through His Incarnation, becoming the Mediator between God and man, propitiating for us the Father against Whom we had sinned, mitigating our disobedience by His own obedience, and giving to us communion with and devotion to our Maker." Thus God was in Christ

[1] v. 14. 2.
[2] III. 18. 7. in amicitiam et concordiam utrosque reducere.
[3] v. 2. 2. "sanguinem qui effusus est...ex quo *auget* (δεύει = perfundit) nostrum sanguinem; et eum panem...ex quo nostra auget corpora."
[4] III. 18. 7. [5] v. 16. 3.

reconciling the world to Himself. For "He bade us say in His prayer, 'Remit to us our debts,' for He is our Father, Whose debtors we are, having transgressed His precept. For how do we obtain remission of sins, unless He Himself, against Whom we have sinned, granted us remission 'through the bowels of the mercy of God, in which He hath visited us,' that is to say, through His Son[1]?"

Reconciliation in this system would consist in the restoration of man to communion with the Father by remission of sin, by the gift of incorruptibility, by the effusion of the Spirit upon our union with the Father, by Christ teaching man to love and serve the Father, by His making His obedience ours through winning us to obey God, and by His renewing in us the Divine image. All this was rendered possible by the Incarnation, in which the ancient enmity of man was brought to a head[2], the ancient handiwork of God was carried to its proper issue, and the life of man was recapitulated in the life of the Son of God Who became the Son of Man. But all this was actually effected by the moral influence and spiritual attractiveness which that Son of God exercised over the sons of men, whom He would make sons of God. Thus "naturalized" to God, we shall glory in our effectual Saviour.

Finally, this reconciliation is universal, embracing Adam and all his posterity. "For it was not merely for those who believed in Him in the time of Tiberius Caesar that Christ came, nor did the Father exert His providence solely for those who are now living, but also on account of all those who from the beginning have not only feared but loved God according to their power, and have dealt

[1] v. 17. 1. [2] iv. 40. 3.

justly and mercifully towards their neighbours, and have yearned to see Christ and to hear His voice[1]." It was for this reason that the Lord descended into the places beneath the earth, proclaiming His own Advent and remission of sins for those who believe in Him. Now all those who had hopes of Him believed in Him, that is, all who foretold His Advent and served His purposes, even the just ones, the patriarchs and the prophets, whose sins He remitted in the same way as He remits ours[2]."

The economy of salvation is, therefore, universal, embracing the past and the future, and being an extension of the Incarnate grace to every man and uniting all in one Body, the Church, in which there is neither Jew nor Gentile, but in which men receive the reward of their labours[3].

[1] IV. 22. 2. [2] IV. 27. 2. [3] IV. 22. 2.

CHAPTER XI

BIBLICAL VIEWS

Interpretation of Scripture, etc.

SPEAKING generally, Irenaeus maintained that the Scriptures are spiritual[1], and to be discerned spiritually. He would not intrust their interpretation to any one outside the pale of the Church. Showing a marked predilection for mystical exegesis himself, he advised the students of Holy Writ to avoid the explanations of the sophists, to take refuge in the Church and to be educated therein in the Scriptures of the Lord[2]. If possible, they were to read the Scriptures with the presbyters who were in the Church and who had the apostolic doctrine[3]. For then the general consistency of Scripture would be manifest. But they who abandon the teaching of the Church accuse the holy presbyters of ignorance, not perceiving that even a private Christian is superior to a blaspheming sophist[4]. Irenaeus did not uphold the Church as the infallible interpreter of Scripture or commit himself to any such position, but he held that some standard such as the Church's "rule of truth" (regula veritatis, II. 27. 1, III. 2. 1) or "preaching" (praeconium Ecclesiae, V. 20. 2) should be employed, as

[1] δλων τῶν γραφῶν πνευματικῶν οὐσῶν, II. 28. 3.
[2] Dominicis scripturis, V. 20. 2.
[3] IV. 32. 1.
[4] V. 20. 2.

a sort of critical test by which "sound" views could be distinguished from the "unsound."

He also recognized the difficulties of Scripture, writing in II. 28. 3, "If certain matters connected with the natural creation are within our sphere of knowledge but others lie beyond our ken, why should we be troubled if, while we are able by the grace of God to explain some of the difficulties in the Scriptures, we must leave others in His keeping, not merely in this present aeon, but also in the aeon to come? So God shall always be the Teacher and man His pupil. And if we, according to this rule, leave certain questions to God, we shall preserve our faith and our position without peril; every Scripture given to us by God will be found consistent, the parables harmonizing with the passages whose meaning is clear and which explain them, and so from many diverse utterances one harmonious melody shall ascend[1] as a *Magnificat* to the great Creator."

He protests against the "obscurum per obscurius" method of exposition which was in vogue among the Gnostics of his day, as in ours. In II. 10. 1 he traces the forced explanations of the heretics to the fact that they explain ambiguous passages by others equally ambiguous, "whereas no question can be solved by another that awaits solution; no difficulty can be removed by another, nor can a greater enigma explain enigmas, but things of that nature must be interpreted by what is manifest, consistent and clear." In the same book[2] he recommends the study of Scripture, and discusses the interpretation of the parables, which are to be explained by the passages

[1] *αἰσθήσεται*. Grabe proposes to correct the Latin *sentiet* to *sentietur*. But the Greek verb does not admit of the passive sense. Stieren suggests *ᾄσθήσεται*, will be sung.

[2] c. 27.

that are self-evident and set down in express terms. And he compares the man who in the case of the parables explains what is obscure by what is more obscure to one who has his lamp untrimmed and flickering when the bridegroom comes, and then has recourse to those who darken the solutions of the parables instead of to him who supplies a clear exposition gratis, and is excluded from the wedding. He himself followed the meaning that flows naturally from the text, testing it by the rule of faith. And he maintains that "the universal Scriptures, both prophets and Gospels, have set down openly and without ambiguity and in such a manner that all can understand the Unity of the Creator Who has made all things through His Word[1]."

In II. 25. 1 he advises expositors not to attach too much importance to numbers, as the Gnostics did, for "all things, both ancient matters and those wrought in modern times by His Word, have been arranged and accomplished with wisdom and diligence by God, and are not to be harmonized with the number thirty[2], but with the underlying argument or reason...for the rule does not depend upon the numbers, but the numbers depend upon the rule. Nor does God depend upon the things made, but the things made depend upon God. For all things are from one and the same God." Irenaeus, however, was influenced himself by numbers in his explanation of the fourfold Gospel, which he accepted for mystical as well as for historical reasons.

In IV. 31. 1 he treats the Old Testament history as containing types of the New, quoting with approval the

[1] II. 27. 2.

[2] So Massuet: the MSS. have XX. But Massuet rightly observes "ad hunc numerum (XXX) non ad XX aptata esse omnia a Deo volebant haeretici."

advice of a certain presbyter to "seek the type" (typum quaerere). At the same time, he protests in v. 35. 1 against the attempt to treat as allegory the prophecies of the temporal and earthly realm of the saints in Isaiah and the Apocalypse. In his exegesis of the Old Testament he adopts the "typical" line. For instance, in his notes on the story of Jacob[1], which he treats as symbolical, though no less real, he remarks that Rachel, for whom Jacob waited, "prefigures the Church for which Christ suffered." This was after the manner of Justin, who wrote in his *Dialogue* (c. 134): "But Leah is your people and synagogue, but Rachel is our Church, and on behalf of these and His servants in both Christ is even still serving." Origen follows Irenaeus in his treatment of the Old Testament, regarding the planting of Eden, for example, as figurative (τροπικῶς) and serving to set forth mysterious truths in a story: while Augustine would treat the life in the garden as a spiritual allegory of the Church, "provided the truth of that history be believed[2]." Irenaeus, with Clement of Rome and Justin Martyr[3], would see types of spiritual truths in the story of Rahab, but while they saw in the scarlet thread a symbol of the blood of Christ, he treated the spies, of whom he says there were three, as types of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit[4]. This was analogy carried beyond all bounds. But he well remarked that Christ is the clue of prophecy, "Who is the treasure hid in the ground, that is the treasure concealed in the Scriptures,

[1] IV. 21. 3.

[2] *De Civ. Dei*, XIII. 21. Haec et si qua alia commodius dici possunt de intelligendo spiritaliter paradiso nemine prohibente dicantur, dum tamen et illius historiae veritas fidelissima rerum gestarum narratione commendata credatur.

[3] Clem. Rom. 12. Justin, *Dial. c. Tryph.* c. cxi.

[4] IV. 20. 12.

being indicated of types and parables[1]." "When the law is read in these days to the Jews it sounds like a fable, for they have not the key of the Incarnation which explains everything, but when read by Christians it is a treasure hid, indeed, in the field, but brought to light and explained by the Cross of Christ. It enriches the understanding of man and manifests the wisdom of God, and announces that so far as man loves God he will advance in the vision of God and the hearing of His words." The concluding words of the previous chapter, IV. 25. 3—"If any one studies the Scriptures attentively, he will find therein a discourse concerning Christ (*de Christo sermonem*) and a prefiguration of the new calling," may have suggested to Augustine his explanation of prophecy—"De Ipso vel propter Ipsum dicta."

In IV. 25. 3 he distinguishes between certain principles that controlled the composition of Scripture, and consequently must regulate its interpretation. "Certain things had to be announced beforehand by the patriarchs in a paternal manner (*paternaliter*); others prefigured by the prophets in a legal fashion (*legaliter*), and others described after the type or model of Christ (*secundum formationem Christi*), by those who received the adoption."

He also finds not merely in the visions and words of the prophets, but in their very actions, foreshadowings and types of things that were to be. For instance, his comment on the action of Hosea in taking a courtesan to wife is as follows: "The Lord will vouchsafe to take to Himself from men of such a character a church which is to be sanctified by fellowship with His Son, just as that woman was sanctified by union with the prophet....

[1] IV. 26. 1.

That which had been done typically by the prophet the apostle shows has been actually performed by Christ in the Church[1]." He makes a similar remark with regard to Moses' marriage with an Ethiopian woman.

"As with God there is nothing devoid of purpose or without a sign[2]," every prophecy has a most clear interpretation after the event, no matter how ambiguous and enigmatical it appeared before[3]. In v. 32. 2 he declares that the promises made to Abraham have been fulfilled. "For his seed, to whom the promise was made, is the Church, which through the Lord receives the adoption in God." Again, "the Church is the Paradise planted in the world." While "Of every tree of the garden ye shall eat," means "of every scripture of the Lord ye shall eat, but ye shall not eat with a proud soul nor may ye touch heresy at all[4]." In John iv. 27—"One soweth and another reapeth[5]," he sees a reference to the two Covenants and the Church reaping the fruit of the seed that was sown by the patriarchs and prophets, and that seed was the *sermo de Christo*[6]. In IV. 29. 1 he discusses certain moral difficulties connected with the Exodus, chiefly the hardening of Pharaoh's heart by God, which was an offence to the Marcionites, who found fault with the character of the God who was represented in such a light. And his argument, "it is one and the same God (Who blesses others) Who blinds those who do not believe but disregard Him; just like the sun His creature, which blinds those who, on account of some weakness of

[1] IV. 20. 12.

[2] IV. 21. 3. Nihil enim vacuum neque sine signo apud Deum. Cf. IV. 16. 1. In signo data sunt haec: non autem sine symbolo erant signa.

[3] IV. 26. 1.

[4] V. 20. 2, cf. Augustine, *De Civ.* XIII. 21.

[5] The Latin verb is *metet*, future.

[6] IV. 25. 3.

their eyes, cannot behold its light, but to those who trust it and follow it, gives a fuller and a larger illumination[1]," is plausible if not convincing. However, he proceeds to speak of "self-chosen darkness" (tenebris quas ipsi sibi elegerunt), and to base the Divine predestination upon the Divine foreknowledge, which lifts the argument to a higher level. "And if now God, knowing how many will not believe, since He has foreknowledge of all things, has given them over unto unbelief, and turned His face from them, leaving them to their self-chosen darkness, what wonder is it if He then abandoned Pharaoh, who would never believe, to his own unbelief?" He devotes the following chapter to the justification of the spoiling of the Egyptians. But a slight knowledge of Hebrew would have saved him from such special pleading. For the Hebrew verb שָׁאַל, used in Ex. xii. 35, in its primary sense means 'to ask,' not 'to borrow[2].' He quotes the words of a certain presbyter who said, "if God did not permit this in the typical Exodus, no one could be saved in the true exodus of faith, for we have all some property which we have acquired from the mammon of unrighteousness." He regarded the Exodus as a type of the going forth of the Church from the Gentiles, to receive the inheritance which Jesus the Son of God, not Moses the Servant of God, should give (IV. 30. 4). In an explanation of Jeremiah xxxi. 10 et sq. he says that the promises are not only to the prophets and the fathers but also to the churches formed out of the Gentiles, which the Spirit calls "isles" because they are situated in the midst of turmoil and endure a storm of blasphemies,

[1] IV. 29. 1.

[2] The primary sense is evidently to be used here. The Egyptians were only too glad to be rid of the Israelites and h ped they would never see them again. This was not like creditors.

and are a haven of safety to those in peril, and a refuge to those who love the height and desire to escape the depth of error[1]. The concluding portion of the treatise deals with Christian and Jewish Apocalyptic, which he would not allow to be treated as mere allegory (v. 35. 1). He believed in a literal fulfilment of such prophecies as Is. vi. 12, lxv. 21, and Rev. xxi. 1—4, in an earthly reign in the new city to be established "at the resurrection of the just, after the advent of Antichrist and the destruction of all the people who serve him. Then the just shall reign on the earth, growing in the vision of the Lord, and through Him shall become accustomed to behold (capere) the glory of God the Father, and shall hold communion and fellowship and union in spiritual matters with the holy angels in His kingdom." These are some examples of Irenaeus' allegorical method of interpretation, which does not appear edifying to us, but which had been popular from the earliest days of Christianity chiefly because it enabled the Christians to interpret the Old Testament Scriptures, the only scriptures then available, in a Christian sense, and to claim them as a Christian and not a Jewish book.

With regard to the mystical method of Scriptural interpretation which we found in Irenaeus and the Fathers generally and which held the field for centuries, it is but a cheap wit that would regard the underlying principle with contempt because of the extravagance of its application. Rationalism and common sense rose in revolt against the searching of the Old Testament for symbols of another set of symbols in the New, and the regarding of the rites and history of the Jewish Church as symbolical of those of the New, especially when this

[1] v. 34. 3.

appeared to be done in the interest of a certain party in the Church. New critical methods introduced a saner exegesis. But the mystical principle of interpretation, which looks for the spirit behind the word of Scripture, is undoubtedly the true one. It was said by one of the Fathers that "the miracles of our Lord and Saviour are to be accepted as having literally taken place, and yet as suggestive of some deeper signification. His works show His power and also declare a mystery[1]." That is why St John called them "signs." In our day when the spirit is asserting its supremacy over matter in many various but simultaneous movements we may yet learn that it is the Divine Spirit within us that alone can teach us to understand the soul of the Scriptures, and as we go to school with the Fathers who were in closer touch with the great realities, we may come to see something in the Scriptures which this enlightened age cannot discern so long as it solely employs the rational method.

He also gives certain directions regarding the reading of Scripture and punctuation, which may have been useful in his day. In III. 7. 2 he points out the necessity of attending to the pauses, especially when reading the Epistles of St Paul, who by reason of the swiftness of his speech and the force of the Spirit frequently fell into the mistake known as hyperbaton or the misplacement of a word. He cites three instances, 2 Cor. iv. 4; Gal. iii. 19, and 2 Thess. ii. 8, where wrong punctuation led to mistakes. The first passage—"In whom the God of this world hath blinded the minds of the unbelieving"—which the Gnostics quoted in support of their notion of a God of this world who was not the Supreme God—

[1] Gregory in Migne, vol. LXXVI. 1082.

should be read so: "In whom God," then pause, and read the rest without break, so that the meaning will be: "God hath blinded the minds of the unbelieving of this world[1]." This was a distinctly ingenious device, but Irenaeus is manifestly wrong. Similarly in Gal. iii. 19: "Wherefore then the law of works? It was added until the seed should come to whom the promise was made, being ordained by angels in the hand of a mediator," the order is, "Wherefore then the law of works? Being ordained by angels in the hand of a mediator, it was added until the seed should come to whom the promise was made." He made a similar comment on the reading of 2 Thess. ii. 8, suggesting that the clause *cujus est adventus secundum operationem Satanae* should follow "iniquus."

We may suitably conclude this section with his remarks on the Church as a teaching body: "The Church has come down to us guarded by the fullest treatment (tractatione plenissima) of the Scriptures, neither permitting anything to be added or anything to be taken away, and her reading is without corruption of the text, and her scriptural exposition is sound and careful, without peril or blasphemy[2]."

Inspiration and Private Judgement

In his exposure of the perversions the Gnostics made of the Scriptures, Irenaeus vindicated the unity and integrity of the Old and New Testaments. He also maintains their inspiration against those who would

[1] Cf. Tertull. *c. Marc.* v. 11. Tertullian suggests the same pause after *in quibus Deus*: but shortly afterwards suggests that the God of this world is the devil.

[2] IV. 33. 8. Custodita sine fictione scripturarum tractatione plenissima.

deny it in whole or in part. The critics and critical problems of his time were much the same as those of ours. His words are still a rebuke to those who, like the Marcionites, would remove the passages they dislike from the text, and also to those who, like the Valentinians, would wrest them from their obvious meaning. In I. 7. 3, he discusses Valentinus' idea of a threefold principle in the prophets. "They divide the prophecies," he writes, "allotting one portion to the 'Mother,' a second to the 'Seed,' and a third to the 'Demiurge.'" In the same way they declared that Jesus spoke certain things under the influence of the Saviour, others under that of the Mother, and others still under that of the Demiurge[1]. This was parallel to their threefold division of man, the earthly, the psychical, and the spiritual. But he maintained that the Word was the one source of inspiration of the Old Testament writings, saying in the fourth book[2]: "Jesus did not make use of the expression, 'Your father Abraham rejoiced to see My day, and he saw it and was glad,' merely for Abraham's sake, but in order to show that all who from the beginning came to the knowledge of God and predicted the advent of Christ, received the revelation from the Son Himself, Who in these last days became an object of sight and a subject of suffering and conversed with men, so that He might from the stones raise up children unto Abraham."

With regard to the inspiration of the Apostles, he writes in III. 1. 1: "After that our Lord had risen from the dead, the Apostles were endued with the power of the Holy Spirit that came upon them from on high, and,

[1] Origen also points out *in Ezek.* I. 200 that they regarded some of the Scriptures as dictated by a more Divine power than the rest. Cf. Tert. (*Adv. Val.*) 28.

[2] IV. 7. 2.

being fully convinced on every point[1], they received perfect knowledge." When describing Ezra's work he used the word 'inspired[2].'

Canon Sanday[3] points out that "both Irenaeus and Tertullian regarded inspiration as determining the choice of particular words and phrases." This form of inspiration is upheld by Irenaeus in a remarkable connection. When combating the Gnostic view that the man Jesus was born of Mary and that the Spirit descended at His Baptism upon the aeon Christ, he declared that the Holy Spirit, anticipating these perverters of the truth and guarding against their false interpretations, said by Matthew: "Now the birth of Christ was on this wise[4]."

With regard to Biblical difficulties, in II. 28. 1 he says that such matters must be left in the hands of God, for we know that the Scriptures are *perfect*, since they are the deliverances of the Word of God and His Spirit, whereas we being much later than the Word of God and His Spirit, are naturally in the same degree more deficient in the knowledge of His mysteries." He also described the Scriptures as spiritual, 'divine,' and 'the Lord's' (dominicae)[5].

At the same time he allowed a certain amount of

[1] ab omnibus adimpleti sunt, cf. promissionem adimpletam III. 16. 2, *ἐπληροφορήθησαν*, cf. Lk. i. 1, and *τῆς πληροφορίας τῆς συνέσεως* Col. ii. 2.

[2] *ἐνέπνευσεν* III. 21. 2. [3] *Inspiration*, p. 34.

[4] III. 16. 2. Christi autem generatio sic erat. "This though very possibly and probably the right reading is not now found in a single Greek MS." (Sanday). All existing Greek MSS. support reading *Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ* (except possibly No. 71, which according to Tischendorf has *Χριστοῦ*, Cod. B, which has *Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ* and probably D, the Greek of which is wanting but the Latin has *Christi*). With these are the Egyptian versions and the Peshito and the Harclean Syriac. For the reading *Χριστοῦ* are all the Latin versions and the Curetonian Syriac. It was evidently the recognized reading in Gaul and Syria, and is probably right as the collocation *Ἰησοῦς Χριστός* occurs only in Acts viii. 37, 1 John iv. 3, Apoc. xii. 17 and is clearly due to a later gloss in all three places. The use of *ὁ Χριστός* in a gospel intended for Jews would have a special force.

[5] II. 28. 3 spiritalibus, II. 35. 4 dominicis...divinis.

play to the human element. For example, we have seen how he regarded St Paul's style and his frequent use of *hyperbaton* as due to the impetuosity of his language as well as to the force of the Spirit within him[1]. A mechanical view of inspiration would be inconsistent even with that amount of individuality. Tertullian goes even further, and allows a progressive development of the Christian spirit in St Paul[2].

As regards the authority of the Scriptures, Irenaeus did not commit himself to any hard and fast rule, recognizing that certain precepts in the New as well as in the Old Testament possessed merely a relative value. He cites, for example, in IV. 15. 1 the well-known formulae of 1 Cor. vii. 12 and 6: "These things I say, not the Lord," and "But this I speak by permission, not by commandment." In his encounter with the Gnostics Irenaeus appealed to Scripture as interpreted by the Church. As some of his opponents claimed a Scriptural basis for their theories he was led into a discussion of certain texts. Among such are: "To all the generation of the aeon of aeons[3]"; "In Him dwelleth the pleroma of God[4]"; "One iota or tittle shall in no wise pass from the law[5]." In their explanation of such passages the Gnostics made the words of Scripture fit in with their views. "Regarding neither the order nor connection of Scripture, they mutilate the truth by taking passages from their context, altering their form and making one thing out of another. Thus they deceive many by their

[1] propter velocitatem sermonum suorum et propter impetum, qui in ipso est Spiritus, III. 7. 2.

[2] *C. Marc.* I. 20. Paulus adhuc in gratia rudis ferventer ut adhuc neophytus, adversus Judaismum; postmodum et ipse usu omnibus omnia futurus ut omnes lucraretur.

[3] Eph. iii. 21. I. 3. 1.

[4] Col. ii. 9. I. 3. 3.

[5] Mt. v. 8. I. 3. 1.

vicious interpretation of the oracles of the Lord[1]." The patchwork made by this process, in recent times familiar to those who have laboured through Mrs Eddy's *Key to the Scriptures*, he likens unto a rearrangement of precious stones, originally constructed to represent a king, into the likeness of a dog or a fox. The gems are still the same, but the form is different[1].

We learn from Irenaeus that in his time there was an orthodox or traditional method of biblical interpretation in the Church which was ignored by the Gnostics[2], who claimed to have a traditional explanation of their own. It would be strange if there were not a large body of oral teaching in the Church, handed down from the time of the apostles who were themselves ministers of a tradition "once for all delivered to the saints." The apostolic writings were written by Churchmen and presuppose acquaintance with the teaching of the Church (see Gal. i. 8, 9). The apostles referred their readers and hearers to a Divine unction, which they alone possessed, but which they shared with the rest (1 John ii. 20). In studying the history of the Early Church we may not lose sight of the greatest factor in its growth and in the formation of its scriptures and tradition, namely the Spirit of Christ who led men to right conduct and to right belief. See the first epistle of St John[3]. Irenaeus has been charged by Ziegler with erecting tradition into the greatest authority in the Church[4]. On

[1] 1. 8. 1. *τὴν μὲν τάξιν καὶ τὸν εἱρμὸν τῶν γραφῶν ὑπερβαίνοντες... μεταφέρουσι δὲ καὶ μεταπλάττουσι.*

[2] See 1. 3. 6. *παρατρέποντες τὰς ἑρμηνείας καὶ ῥαδιουργοῦντες τὰς ἐξηγήσεις*, altering the interpretations and playing fast and loose with the expositions, i.e. those accepted by the Church.

[3] See also 1 Cor. xii. 3. "No man can say that Jesus is the Lord save by the Holy Ghost."

[4] Die Tradition ist also dem Irenäus das an und für sich vollkommen

one occasion he allowed himself to be misled by a tradition which he said came from John to the effect that our Lord lived to be near the age of fifty years. But it is not correct to say that he does not examine the evangelical history, but simply assumes the authority of the tradition[1]. He is careful to put the gospel before the tradition, saying, "As the Gospel and all the elders testify, who met John the disciple of the Lord in Asia, that John had given this information to them[2]." And he appeals to the Gospel authority of John viii. 57, "thou art not yet fifty years old," arguing that this could only be appropriately said to one who was over forty years, but not to one who was only thirty. In his letter to Florinus he says that "everything that Polycarp related was in agreement with the Scriptures." The Scriptures were then his chief authority and test of truth. In his controversy with the Gnostics it is chiefly on the Scripture that he relies; and he argues that the Church is the proper custodian and interpreter of the Scriptures which are her own. The Gnostics were, however, adroit antagonists. For when "they are confuted from the Scriptures, they shift their position and censure the Scriptures, declaring that they are wrong, or are not authoritative[3], or that there are various readings[4], and that the truth cannot be discovered from these by those who do not know the tradition[5]." Tertullian's method

zu reichende, alles Wesentliche in sich begreifende, allgemein bekannte, die Schrift ergänzende und ihre Auslegung regelnde Princip der christlichen Heilserkenntniss, *welches eben wegen dieser Eigenschaften unbedingte Autorität in Anspruch nehmen muss. Des Irenäus Lehre*, s. 30.

[1] Stewart Means (*Saint Paul and the Ante-Nicene Church*, p. 192).

[2] II. 22. 5. [3] III. 2. 1, neque sint ex auctoritate.

[4] Varie sint dictae, or are expressed in different ways. They argued that the statements were conflicting or ambiguous.

[5] III. 2. 1.

as laid down in *De Praescriptionibus*[1] was not to argue with the heretics concerning the Scriptures, but simply to appeal to the true faith which must be in the possession of the Church, and which is the only security for scriptural truth. "We must inquire," he writes, "whose are the Scriptures; by whom, and through whom, and to whom, and when the Christian discipline was delivered. For wherever we shall find true Christian discipline and faith, there we shall have scriptural truth, expository truth and the truth of all Christian traditions." This plan, however, did not always succeed. For Irenaeus points out that when the Gnostics are referred to "that tradition which originated from the Apostles, which is preserved by the successions of the presbyters in the Churches, they object to tradition, saying that they themselves, being wiser, not merely than the presbyters but even than the Apostles, have discovered the truth in its purity, whereas the Apostles blended with the words of the Saviour the things of the law. They also assert that not only the Apostles but also our Lord Himself received their inspiration on different occasions from the lowest quarter (the Demiurge), the middle region, and the highest place (the pleroma), but that they themselves know the hidden mystery without ambiguity, pollution and alloy. And the result is that they obey neither Scripture nor tradition[2]." The Gnostics also boasted that they had discovered their system in the *Agrapha*[3], certain non-scriptural writings.

Irenaeus was forced to appeal frequently to antiquity and apostolic tradition as a safeguard of the faith and of

[1] c. 19, "ubi enim apparuerit esse veritatem et disciplinae et fidei Christianae, illic erit veritas Scripturarum, et expositionum, et omnium traditionum Christianarum."

[2] III. 2. 2. [3] I. 8. 1, ἐξ ἀγράφων ἀναγινώσκοντες.

the Bible in the Church against such new-fangled errors. "Suppose," he wrote, "there arose a dispute on some matter of importance among us, should we not have to refer to the most ancient churches in which the Apostles lived, and learn from them what would be actually clear and right about the question? But if the Apostles had left us no writings, should we not have to follow the order of tradition they handed down to those to whose charge they entrusted the churches? This is what is done by many foreign nations who believe in Christ, having salvation written on their heart by the Spirit without paper or ink, and diligently adhering to the old tradition[1]." Tertullian, in the work alluded to[2], refers the more curious in the matters concerning salvation to "those apostolic churches in which the very seats of the Apostles are placed, in which their very letters are read, ringing with their voice and recalling their appearance." Some such advice is necessary at times to check the abuse of private judgement. For, as Archbishop Whately said, "were the object of our study an ordinary classical writer, an interpreter, who, devoid of sobriety of judgment, should scorn to study the opinions of the wise and learned men who had preceded him, would be likely to arrive at conclusions more startling for their novelty than valuable for their correctness."

The Old Testament and the New

Irenaeus emphasized the true position of the Old Testament in the history of revelation. While sympathizing with the practical lessons and spiritual views of

[1] III. 4. 1.

[2] c. 36, "percurre ecclesias apostolicas, apud quas ipsae adhuc cathedrae apostolorum suis locis praesident; apud quas ipsae authenticae literae eorum recitantur, sonantes vocem et repraesentantes faciem uniuscujusque."

both covenants, he touched the chord that vibrates through all the harmonies of Scripture when he declared that Christ was the key and link of the twain. He also held that the revelation of God was progressive, which seems to be the true principle of exposition. In the words of Dr Harnack, "The fundamental features of Irenaeus' conception are as follows: the Mosaic law and the New Testament dispensation of grace both emanated from one and the same God, and were granted for the salvation of the human race in a form appropriate to the times. The two are in part different; but the difference must be conceived as due to causes that do not affect the unity of the author and of the main points[1]." There was no change in the revelation, but an increase.

If it is necessary in our day to insist upon this point when arguing with those who regard the law of the Old Testament as a compilation made in the interests of a certain class, it was equally necessary in those days when the Church was confronted with the Gnostics, who rejected the Old in whole or in part, and selected certain passages of the New Testament to the exclusion of the rest. While subordinating the Old to the New Testament, according to his view of a Divine accommodation to the needs of man and a human advance towards the perfections of God, he maintained the organic unity and continuity of the Scriptures, asserting that both covenants were prefigured in Abraham[2]. Jesus did not annul but fulfilled the law, "performing the offices of the high priest, propitiating God for man, cleansing the lepers, healing the sick, and then dying that exiled man might

[1] *History of Dogma*, Eng. Trans. II. 305.

[2] IV. 25. 3, ut praefigurarentur in eo utraque testamenta...principi et praenuntiatori facto nostrae fidei...in unam fidem Abrahae colligens eos, qui ex utroque testamento apti sunt in aedificationem Dei.

go forth from his condemnation and return without fear to his inheritance[1]."

In IV. 9 he bases the unity of Scripture on the unity of God, the various parts of whose revelation mutually correspond. The Householder, even the Lord, Who brings out of His treasure things new and old, adapts His teaching to the condition of His people. To those who are slaves and undisciplined He delivers a law, but to those who are free and justified by faith He gives suitable precepts. And both Testaments have been given by one and the same Householder, the Word of God[2].

The same views were expressed by Clement of Alexandria and Augustine of Hippo. The former wrote: "It is manifest that there is one God of both Testaments, seeing that they are two in name, given at different times, though in regular stages, but one in power. The Old and the New are given by one God through His Son, Who taught the same way of salvation, that commenced in the prophets and was consummated in the Gospel through one and the same Lord[3]." And the latter declared: "We wrong the Old Testament when we deny it comes from the same just and good

[1] IV. 8. 2. non enim solvebat, sed adimplebat legem.

[2] Utraque testamenta unus et idem paterfamilias produxit, Verbum Dei, Dominus noster Jesus Christus, qui et Abrahae et Moysi collocutus est, qui nobis in novitate restituit libertatem, et multiplicavit eam, quae ab ipso est, gratiam.

[3] *Strom.* II. 444. *ἐπειδὴ δύο αὗται (διαθῆκαι) ὀνόματι καὶ χρόνῳ, καθ' ἡλικίαν καὶ προκοπὴν οἰκονομικῶς δεδομέναι, δυνάμει μία οὖσαι, ἡ μὲν παλαιὰ, ἡ δὲ καινὴ, διὰ Υἱοῦ παρ' ἑνὸς θεοῦ χωρηγοῦνται...τὴν ἐκ προφητείας εἰς Εὐαγγέλιον τετελειωμένην, δι' ἑνὸς καὶ τοῦ αὐτοῦ Κυρίου διδάσκων σωτηρίαν.* Cf. also *Strom.* III. 545, *τὸν αὐτὸν θεὸν διὰ νόμου καὶ προφητῶν καὶ Εὐαγγελίου ὁ Ἀπόστολος κηρύσσει.* In *Strom.* III. 549 he opposed Tatian, saying that the 'old man' is the law, but the 'new man' is the Gospel, but it is the same man and Lord who is the author of both, *παλαιὰ καινίζων.*

God, and, on the other hand, we wrong the New Testament if we place the Old on a level with it[1]."

The Old Testament, valuable as it is, is limited when compared with the complete and catholic character of the New. "The law which was given for liberty is greater than that which was given for service; and was, therefore, not confined to one nation but was spread through the whole world. But there is one and the same Lord Who gives something greater than the temple, or Solomon or Jonah to men, and that is His own presence and the resurrection from the dead, not indeed changing the deity, or preaching another Father, but the very same Who has ever more and more gifts to bestow upon the members of His household, and as their love to God increases, gives more and greater things" (IV. 9. 2). The New Testament teaches of the same Father, the same Christ and the same spirit as the Old, but with more light and fulness. "When our consummation has been attained, we shall not see another Father, nor expect another Christ and Son of God than Him Whom we believe and love, nor receive another spirit than He Who is now with us, but we shall make increase and advance in their very selves, so that we shall enjoy the gifts of God, no longer as in a mirror but face to face. So now after the Incarnation we have learnt of no other Father than Him Who was revealed from the beginning, nor of another Christ the Son of God than Him Who was announced by the prophets (IV. 9. 2). Seeing that the New Testament was known to and proclaimed by the prophets, He Who was the author of it was also proclaimed, being made manifest as the Father wished, so

[1] *De Gestis Pelag.* v. (15). "Sicut veteri Testamento si esse ex Deo bono et summo negetur, ita et novo fit injuria si veteri aequetur."

that those who believe in Him might always make progress, and by means of these testaments might come to the ripeness of perfection[1]." "For here is one salvation and one God, but the precepts which mould the life of man are many and the steps which lead to God are not a few" (IV. 9. 3).

Accordingly, the secret of the unity of the Scriptures amid their diversity is this, that they are from one and the same Father. "All the Apostles taught that there were two testaments (or covenants) for the two peoples; but that there was but one and the same God Who ordained both for the benefit of men who would believe[2]." "For how did the Scriptures testify of Him unless all things had always been revealed to believers by one and the same God through the Word, now speaking with His creature, anon giving him the law, now reproving and now exhorting, and eventually setting free His servant and adopting him as a son, and in the fulness of time bestowing upon him the inheritance of incorruption that leads to the perfection of man? For God made man for growth[3]." And He intended him "to advance in the way of salvation by means of the testaments[4]." Again he writes: "God is not like an earthly king, whose gifts are capriciously bestowed, but He is always the same and

[1] per Testamenta maturescere *perfectum salutis*. Harvey reads profectum (προκοπήν); Grabe regards it as equivalent to "ad perfectam salutem"; Massuet interprets it as perfection or consummation; Erasmus and others read *per effectum*. Seeing that *adveniente perfecto* (when the consummation has been reached) occurs in the previous paragraph (IV. 9. 2), there ought to be no difficulty if *perfectum salutis* be treated as accusative of respect after *maturescere*: cf. ascendere ad perfectum (V. 19. 2). Cf. use of *maturescere*, IV. 37. 7 et tandem aliquando maturus fiat homo, in tantis maturescens ad videndum et capiendum Deum; IV. 5. 1 qui temporalia fecit propter hominem ut maturescens in eis fructificet immortalitatem; V. 29. 1 maturans (active) ad immortalitem. Profectum occurs in IV. 11. 1 homo profectum percipiens.

[2] IV. 32. 2. [3] IV. 11. 1. Cf. Clem. Alex. *Strom.* II. 444.

[4] IV. 9. 3.

ever desires to give a larger share of grace to mankind[1]." Accordingly, the progress of His revelation is uniform and orderly. The course of revelation was adapted to the spiritual life and development of man. As God is the goal of man's life and aspirations, the Divine teachings have been adapted to this end, that man might learn to understand the mysteries of God, first in symbols, then in realities. "The former testament was not given without purpose, casually or in vain, but to bend[2] those to whom it was given to the will of God for their own good. For God needs no service from man. It, therefore, exhibited a type of heavenly things, inasmuch as man was not able to perceive by his own vision the things of God; and it contained symbols of ordinances which are now in the Church, so that our faith might be established, and it had a prophecy of things to come so that man might learn that God had foreknowledge of all things[3]." This is an interesting use of prophecy.

While Irenaeus is not blind to the differences between the Old and the New Testament, which were emphasized by his opponents (III. 12. 12), he maintained that the chief difference between them was one of degree, not of kind, of progress, not of principle, inasmuch as they had the same origin and author. Temporary concessions were made during the earlier stages of both as an accommodation to human weakness. But these permissions were provisional, and served the purpose of leading men to higher things. See IV. 15. 2 and III. 12. 11, where he describes both Testaments as containing precepts that were concessions to human weakness and as themselves

[1] IV. 9. 3.

[2] *concurvans* (συγκάμπτων), Massuet from Clerm. concurrans, al. concurrens.

[3] IV. 32. 2.

"adapted to the times[1]." They were both given "for the benefit of man."

The key of the Old is the New. For the law can only be read in the light of the Incarnation. When the light from the Cross fell upon the dark page of Scripture, it became a treasure to the Christians, who alone can understand and explain the Incarnation of the Son of God[2]. The Incarnation brought additional light and new grace to man, for "one and the same Lord gave a larger share of grace than was contained in the Old Testament to a later generation through the Incarnation[3]."

Origen said the same thing in his fine phrase: "The inspired character of the prophetic writings and the spiritual nature of the law of Moses flashed (ἔλαμψεν) upon man when Jesus came to dwell among us. Clear proofs of the inspiration of the Old Testament could not well be given before that Advent. But then the light that was in the law was unveiled and shone out, and its good things came gradually within the ken of man[4]."

The love of God is the ideal of both covenants, being the fulfilment of the spirit of the moral law of the Jews and being the moral law of Christ. The Lord Himself uttered the words of the Decalogue. Therefore they remain a permanent possession, having been extended and expanded, but not abrogated, by His Advent in the flesh. But the Mosaic law of bondage was cancelled by

[1] IV. 15. 2, Si igitur in Novo Testamento quaedam praecepta secundum ignoscentiam Apostoli concedentes inveniuntur, propter quorundam incontinentiam ut non obdurati tales, in totum desperantes salutem suam, apostatae fiant a Deo; non oportet mirari si et in veteri testamento idem Deus tale aliquid voluit fieri *pro utilitate populi*. III. 12. 11, Cognoscens et eam quae est secundum Moysem legem, et gratiam Novi Testamenti, utraque *apta temporibus*, *ad utilitatem humani generis* ab uno et eodem praestita Deo.

[2] IV. 26. 1.

[3] IV. 11. 3.

[4] *De Prin.* IV. 6.

the covenant of liberty. The laws, however, which are natural, noble and universal have received extension and intensity, so that the man may know God the Father and love Him with all his heart and follow His word, and abstain not only from sinful deeds but even from evil thoughts[1]. "Christianity," wrote Lord Beaconsfield, "may be incomprehensible without Judaism, but Judaism is incomplete without Christianity." For the pre-eminence of the New Testament is assured by its higher tone of morality, its purer faith, its grander hope. As Irenaeus well remarks, "In the New Testament faith has been enhanced by the Incarnation of the Son of God, so that man might have a share in the Deity; and morality has been equally raised by being extended to purity of thought, conversation and word[2]." Mr Latham in *Pastor Pastorum* expresses this distinction: "Our Lord," he writes, "does not destroy the law, but supersedes it by bringing God's ways to light, and merging in this light the previous partial revelations of which the Mosaic law was one. A mathematician supersedes the practical rules which the pupil at first employs for solving particular cases of a problem by giving a complete and general solution of the whole subject. This may illustrate the

[1] IV. 16. 5, quae autem naturalia et liberalia, et communia omnium, auxit et dilatavit sine invidia largiter donans hominibus per adoptionem, Patrem scire Deum et diligere eum ex toto corde, etc. See also IV. 13. 4, naturalia omnia praecepta communia sunt nobis et illis, in illis quidem initium et ortum habuerunt; in nobis autem augmentum et adimpletionem perceperunt. Assentire enim Deo, et sequi ejus verbum, et super omnia diligere eum, et proximum sicut seipsum, et abstinere ab omni mala operatione, et quaecunque talia communia utrisque sunt, unum et eundem ostendunt Deum.

[2] IV. 28. 2, in novo Testamento ea quae est ad Deum fides hominum aucta est, additamentum accipiens Filium Dei, ut et homo fieret particeps Dei; ita et diligentia conversationis adaucta est, cum non solum a malis operibus abstinere jubemur, sed etiam ab ipsis malis cogitationibus, et sermonibus vacuis et verbis scurrilibus.

way in which our Lord merges the particular case of human conduct in a wider rule embracing human dispositions, and which regards not only what men do, but also what they are, and what they will become." In the words of Augustine[1], "Novum Testamentum in Vetere latet, Vetus Testamentum in Novo patet." The New Testament lies hidden in the Old; the Old lies open in the New. Irenaeus' order is: "The Lord, the Apostles and the prophets[2]." But while thus emphasizing the difference between the New and the Old, Irenaeus is careful to insist upon their unity and harmony[3]. As he looked back from the standpoint of the New Testament upon the Old, he could find nothing there that could add to the revelation of the things of Christ that is given in the New, but it served to complete his view of the one grand scheme of Divine grace which was perfected in Christ, the continuity and proportion of which can only be fully realized when one traces its gradual development through the prophets, the Lord Himself and His apostles, and believes in the revelation given "a prophetis omnibus, et Apostolis et ab ipso Spiritu," III. 19. 2.

[1] *Quaest. 73 in Exodum.*

[2] III. 17. 4. ὁ Κύριος μαρτυρεῖ καὶ οἱ ἀπόστολοι ὁμολογοῦσι καὶ οἱ προφῆται κηρύττουσι (the logical order), but in I. 8. 1 we have παραβολὰς κυριακὰς ἢ ῥήσεις προφητικὰς ἢ λόγους ἀποστολικούς, and in I. 9. 1 οὔτε Προφῆται ἐκήρυξαν, οὔτε ὁ Κύριος ἐδίδαξεν οὔτε Ἀπόστολοι παρέδωκαν (chronological order), and in II. 35. 3 praedicatio Apostolum, et Domini magisterium et Prophetarum annuntiatio (the reverse order).

[3] unitas et consonantia, III. 12. 12. Cf. Clem. Alex. *Strom.* VI. 784, μουσικὴν συμφωνίαν τὴν ἐκκλησιαστικὴν νόμου καὶ προφητῶν ὁμοῦ καὶ ἀποστόλων σὺν καὶ τῷ Εὐαγγελίῳ (cf. *Adv. Haer.* I. 3. 6). See further *Strom.* III. 551, τὴν ἀκολουθίαν τοῦ νόμου πρὸς τὸ Εὐαγγέλιον. See also his remarks on the *Ecclesiastical Canon*, *Strom.* VI. 804, where he defines it as ἡ συνῳδία καὶ ἡ συμφωνία νόμου τε καὶ προφητῶν τῇ κατὰ τὴν τοῦ Κυρίου παρουσίαν παραδιδομένῃ διαθήκῃ.

The Law and the Gospel

Irenaeus has been censured by an able American writer[1] for adopting "the conception of the Gospel as the 'Nova Lex' which appears on the very threshold of this century," and for not grasping, in the writer's opinion, the fundamental religious difference between the law and the Gospel. No doubt the hostile attitude of the Gnostics to the Old Testament caused the Church people to emphasize the historical unity of the two covenants. But it is not quite accurate to say that Irenaeus "lost sight of the essential originality of the new covenant in its spiritual interpretation of life and its religious significance." "Irenaeus," he admits, "insists upon the novelty of the Gospel; but when we seek to discover in what this novelty consists, we do not find that it is in the abrogation of the law and the establishment of a religious, spiritual and filial relation, but in some purely historical and external phenomena which of themselves do not contain any principle of spiritual life." Now there are passages in Irenaeus which show that he recognized that the Gospel did introduce a new spiritual relation of man to God. See IV. 13. 2 et sq. where he describes the law as working by compulsion, and the Word of God as liberating the soul of man not that he might depart from God but that, having obtained more of His grace, he might love Him more (plus gratiam ejus adepti, plus eum diligamus). The liberty of loving and serving God as His freeborn sons[2], faith in Christ and His example,

[1] Rev. Stewart Means in *St Paul and the Nicene Church* (pp. 182 et sq.).

[2] IV. 13. 2, liberi, children, as well as free men; eam pietatem et obedientiam quae est erga patrem familias, esse quidem eandem et servis et liberis. See also III. 20. 2, de homine qui fuit inobediens Deo, dehinc

through Whom, in mercy, we have received the adoption, increased confidence in God (majorem fiduciam), a greater spirit of affection and obedience (pleniorem subjectionem et affectionem infixam) in our hearts to Him, coupled with a larger extension of the principles of the old law and the universal character of the Gospel, and the new emphasis upon the inner life, the purity of motive and singleness of aim, these alterations were the work of Him, "non dissolventis Legem sed adimplentis et dilatantis in nobis," and were intended to lead to a *major et gloriosior operatio.* Under the old law the body helped to train the soul: under the gospel the soul serves to purify the body[1]. Surely this was a radical and a spiritual change effected by One Who frequently Himself drew upon the Hebrew scriptures for the illustrations and subjects of His own discourses, and Who came not to destroy but to fulfil the Old in the New by giving a fuller revelation of the Father and a larger share of the Divine Spirit and liberty and love to those who believe and obey. Whereas obedience is the practical test of belief[2], and faith is an inner principle that is manifested in obedience[3], belief and obedience are themselves supported upon and inspired by the spiritual and Divine power of love. The knowledge of God which is through the Son renews man; to believe in God is inseparable from abiding

misericordiam consecutus est, *per Filium Dei eam quae est per ipsum percipiens adoptionem.* In v. 10. 2 he quotes Rom. viii. 14—"as many as are led by the Spirit of God they are the sons of God." See also IV. 41. 3, quando credunt et subjecti sunt Deo perseverant et doctrinam ejus custodiunt, filii sunt Dei. See III. 6. 1, de his qui adoptionem perceperunt ...hi autem sunt ecclesia, and Christus...qui filios Dei facit credentes in nomen suum.

[1] IV. 13. 2, Lex per ea quae foris erant corporalia animam erudiebat; Verbum autem liberans animam et per ipsam corpus voluntarie emundari docuit. The spiritual principle is made supreme, cf. II. 33. 2.

[2] IV. 6. 5, credere autem ei est facere ejus voluntatem.

[3] IV. 41. 3, above.

in His love; and the love of God gives life[1]. (1) To embrace God in the heart through faith, Who has given us the adoption of sons[2], and Who gives to those who love Him a vision of Himself[3] and the enjoyment of His goodness[4]; (2) to have a spiritual apprehension of Christ[5], Who washes and cleanses the man who is in bondage to sin[6]; to embrace the Word and ascend to Him surpassing the angels, and to be fashioned after the image and likeness of God[7]; and (3) to carry the Spirit within us Who makes us spiritual and gives us an earnest of immortality and makes us conform to the Word of God[8]—these are some of the Gospel privileges, which Irenaeus fully acknowledged. Is it correct then to say that a morality based upon such principles and which could find expression in such a sentence as this, "It is not sacrifices that sanctify the man, but the pure conscience of the offerer that sanctifies the sacrifice" (IV. 18. 3), is "external and superficial," or that "the inner or personal and subjective character of faith as a communion of the soul with God and a union with Christ is not recognized by him[9]"?

[1] Agnitio Dei renovat hominem (V. 12. 4); Agnitio enim Patris Filius;...et per Filium revelata (IV. 6. 7); credere Deo et perseverare in dilectione (II. 26. 1), dilectione quae hominem vivificat (II. 26. 1).

[2] *τοὺς χωροῦντας καὶ βλέποντας αὐτὸν διὰ πίστεως* (IV. 20. 5); *διὰ τῆς υἱοθεσίας*, receiving the gift of the Spirit (V. 12. 2).

[3] hoc concedit iis qui se diligunt, id est, videre Deum (IV. 20. 5).

[4] *ἀπολαύειν τῆς χρηστότητος αὐτοῦ* (*ibid.*).

[5] post agnitionem Christi (IV. 27. 2).

[6] qui abluit et emundat eum hominem qui peccato fuerat obstructus (IV. 27. 1).

[7] capiat verbum, et ascendat ad eum, supergrediens angelos, et fiat secundum imaginem et similitudinem Dei (V. 36. 2).

[8] qui portant Spiritum ejus (IV. 20. 5); assuescentes capere et portare Deum...pignus hoc habitans in nobis (cf. Spiritus Dei habitat in nobis) spiritales facit, et absorbitur mortale ab immortalitate (V. 8. 1); caro conformis facta Verbo Dei (V. 9. 2).

[9] Stewart Means (op. cit. pp. 188, 190). The same writer says "Irenaeus nowhere speaks of prayer, while it is the burden of all St Paul's writings" (p. 189). But see IV. 18. 6, est altare in caelis: illuc enim *preces nostrae* et oblationes diriguntur.

CHAPTER XII

THE CANON OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

THE process of the formation of the Canon of the New Testament is wrapt in obscurity. It emerges quite suddenly in the works of Tertullian, Irenaeus, and the Muratorian fragment[1], and a note of Melito of Sardis preserved in the history of Eusebius[2]. But it was to be expected that such a canon would be formed at some time by a Church which was aware of the influence exercised by the Jewish Canon upon the composition of early Christian writings. Certain circumstances mentioned by Irenaeus hastened the formation of the Canon in the different communities. Controversies with the Montanists, who claimed inspiration for their prophetic utterances and rejected the gospel of St John because of the promise of the Paraclete, which Montanus claimed for himself[3]; with Marcion, who, as Tertullian says, "openly used a knife not a pen when dealing with the Scriptures[4]," and only accepted a mutilated version of

[1] Assigned by Tischendorf to 160—170; by Hilgenfeld to the time of Irenaeus, by Westcott to 170; by Harnack to 170—190. According to the latter there was no Canon of the N.T. in Rome before 200 A.D. *Theolog. Lit.* 188, 643.

[2] IV. 26. [3] III. 11. 9. See Harvey's note II. 51.

[4] *De Praes.* 38. And *Adv. Haer.* III. 12. 12. Unde Marcion et ei qui ab eo sunt, ad intercidendas conversi sunt scripturas, quasdam quidem in totum non cognoscentes, secundum Lucam autem Evangelium et Epistolas Pauli decurtantes, haec sola legitima esse dicunt, quae ipsi minoraverunt. See further I. 27. 2, where Marcion is said to have mutilated both St Luke's Gospel and the Pauline Epistles, cutting out of the former all that referred

the Third Gospel and the Pauline Epistles; with Valentinus and his school, who had more gospels than the original four, using chiefly one they styled "the gospel of truth," which was full of blasphemy[1]; with the Gnostic Marcosians, who used an infinite number of apocryphal works which were palpable forgeries[2]; with the Ebionites, who only read the Gospel of Matthew and rejected the writings of St Paul because they alleged he was an apostate from the law; with those who separated Jesus from Christ, saying that Christ remained impassible but that Jesus suffered, and preferred the Gospel of Mark[3], and with those "who pervert the sense of Scripture[4]," and "garble its passages[5]"—these several conflicts made a fixed and recognized list of inspired writings a necessity.

Other causes which helped to forward the work of the settlement of the New Testament Canon were (1) the collection of manuscripts for the libraries of Caesarea and Alexandria, (2) the translation of the gospels and epistles into different dialects and languages, (3) the use of vellum books instead of papyrus rolls, (4) the formation of the creeds, and (5) the desire of the Church to seal the apostolic source of her faith and constitution. It was felt necessary to give to the words of the Lord and to

to our Lord's generation, and to God the Father as the Creator; and from the latter erasing every allusion to the Creator as the Father of our Lord and to prophecies which foretold His coming.

[1] III. 11. 9, veritatis Evangelium in nihilo conveniens Apostolorum Evangeliis.

[2] I. 20. 1, ἀμύθητον πλῆθος ἀποκρύφων καὶ νόθων γραφῶν.

[3] III. 11. 1. The difficulty is to know who are meant. The Ophites, Harvey suggests. They may have identified the Gospel of the Egyptians which they used (Hippolytus *Ph.* v. 7) with St Mark the founder of the See of Alexandria. According to Origen *Adv. Cels.* 6. 28, the Ophites cursed Jesus.

[4] III. 12. 12, Scripturas quidem confitentur interpretationes vero convertunt.

[5] I. 19. 1, ἐκλέγοντες ἐκ τῶν γραφῶν.

the "acts" and letters of the Apostles the imprimatur of "sacred," and thus safeguard them from interpolation and distinguish them from other books which were read for general edification.

There must have been such a canon, if not formally made, at least generally recognized, in the days of Irenaeus. Otherwise his arguments against the falsification of the Scriptures by subtractions and additions would have had no point. "Such a collection," Harnack observes[1], "is regarded by Irenaeus and Tertullian as completed. A refusal on the part of the heretics to recognize this or that book is already made a severe reproach against them. Their bibles are tested by the Church compilation as the older one, and the latter itself is already used exactly like the Old Testament." We already see the results of the existence of such a canon in Irenaeus, (1) harmonistic interpretations, (2) theories of inspiration, (3) the recognized authority, (4) sufficiency of the Scriptures, and (5) combination and collection of passages and texts. Truly no greater creative act on the part of the new Church could be conceived than its assignment of a rank and position to its own writings equal if not superior to that of the Old Testament. And yet this act must have been made some time previous to the composition of this great treatise, for Irenaeus not merely applied the term "Scriptures" to the gospels and epistles of the N. T., thereby coordinating them with the O. T. (III. 1), but he placed the apostolic books on a higher level than the old, referring in connection with John the Baptist[2], who was more than a prophet, "occupying the place both of a prophet and an apostle," to the Pauline expression, "first apostles and secondly prophets," in

[1] *History of Dogma*, II. 44. [2] III. 11. 4.

which he read an indication of the relative value of the Old and New Testaments. This statement evidently applies to the apostolic letters as well as to the Gospels. For in I. 3. 6 he distinguishes between the "evangelical and apostolic" works, the usual name for the collection of New Testament writings[1]—compare Tertullian, *De Bapt.* 15, "tam ex Domini evangelio quam ex apostoli litteris"—on the one hand, and those of the law and the prophets on the other[2]. Although the earliest list of canonical scriptures of the New Testament—that of the Muratorian fragment, the Latin of which has been published by Dr Zahn—is allotted by Harnack to 170–190 A.D., and, indeed, may have been earlier, we find that about the same time every book of the New Testament, except the Epistle to Philemon, which was, however, cited by Ignatius, and 3 John, was quoted by Irenaeus. He is, therefore, one of the earliest witnesses of the New Testament, to which he refers by name in IV. 9. 3, "Novo enim Testamento cognito et praedicato per prophetas."

The Gospels

The work of sifting the true Gospels from the false had already commenced before the treatise saw the light of day. Hegesippus, an early authority on episcopal succession, in his *Memoirs* had already (A.D. 180) distinguished the apocryphal from the canonical writings[3].

[1] Cf. Clement of Alex. *Strom.* v. 784, where he speaks of the harmony of the law and the prophets, and of the Apostles and the Gospels.

[2] *ἐκ τῶν εὐαγγελικῶν καὶ τῶν ἀποστολικῶν...ἐκ νόμου καὶ προφητῶν*, cf. I. 8. 1, *παραβολὰς κυριακὰς ἢ ῥήσεις προφητικὰς ἢ λόγους ἀποστολικούς.*

[3] Eus. *H.E.* IV. 22, where Hegesippus is represented as speaking of a Gospel according to the Hebrews and a Syriac Gospel, and saying that certain *τῶν ἀποκρύφων* were concocted by some heretics of his own time, and quoting from an "unwritten Jewish tradition."

The steps of this sifting process were many and various. Couched in a language innocent of later theological formulae, and of the Docetic and Gnostic controversies (unlike the Fourth Gospel), stereotyped in memory, handed down by word of mouth, perhaps committed to writing in a day that was full of the traditions of the Jewish temple and the priestly aristocracy, when the air was still vibrating with rabbinical quibbles, the Synoptic Gospels are now easily distinguished from the apocryphal Gospels of the Infancy of Christ, the Protevangelion, and the Nativity of Mary, etc., which present a strong negative argument for the historical truth of our Gospels. But in early times the apocryphal Gospels were also read in the churches. Serapion, Bishop of Antioch (A.D. 190—203), found the Gospel of Peter read in Rhossus, and allowed its use with some cautions. But after he had procured a copy he discovered Docetic tendencies, which he denounced[1], and which are also apparent in the fragment of the gospel discovered in Egypt in 1886. Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* III. 465) distinguishes the four Gospels from that according to the Egyptians, which Origen characterized as an heretical writing. The latter also mentioned the Gospel of the Twelve Apostles as an heretical writing (*Homil. in Luc.* III. 932).

Devoid of extravagant details and Docetic ideas, the four Gospels were freely enriched with notes and comments by churchmen and heretics. Harmonies and expositions composed of these four served to place them upon a pedestal of their own, so that in the days of Irenaeus they were regarded as the only canonical Gospels or as the "four-formed Gospel[2]." He gives

[1] Eusebius *H.E.* VI. 12.
[2] *τετράμορφον τὸ Εὐαγγέλιον* (twice) III. 11. 8.

certain mystical reasons why they should be neither more nor less than four. In a passage that recalls the *Shepherd* of Hermas[1], in which the Church is described as an aged woman who became young, and is seated upon a stool that rested upon four feet and stood firmly, "for the world is held together by four elements[2]," Irenaeus states that while the organic unity of the Gospels is assured because "they are held together by one Spirit[3]," its fourfold form corresponds to the four quarters of the heaven, the four principal winds, the four-visaged cherubim in the Jewish dispensation, "whose faces are symbols of the operation of the Son of God," and the four catholic covenants given to mankind[4].

His words on the Gospels themselves are too important to be omitted. In III. 1. 1 he wrote: "Matthew published a written gospel, lit. a writing or scripture of a gospel, among the Hebrews in their own language, while Peter and Paul were preaching at Rome and founding the Church: and after their decease Mark, the disciple and interpreter of Peter, he also handed down to us in writing what Peter used to preach[5]. And Luke,

[1] Vis. III. 13.

[2] ὁ κόσμος διὰ τεσσάρων στοιχείων κρατεῖται.

[3] ἑνὶ δὲ πνεύματι συνεχόμενον III. 11. 8.

[4] III. 11. 8, τέσσαρα κλίματα τοῦ κόσμου, τέσσαρα καθολικὰ πνεύματα, τὰ Χερουβὶμ τετραπρόσωπα, (τὰ πρόσωπα αὐτῶν εἰκόνες τῆς πραγματείας τοῦ Υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ), τετράμορφα τὰ ζῶα, τετράμορφον τὸ εὐαγγέλιον καὶ ἡ πραγματεία τοῦ κυρίου, τέσσαρες καθολικαὶ διαθῆκαι (Noah's, Abraham's, Moses', Christ's).

[5] The influence of Papias is apparent in this passage. Of Matthew Irenaeus wrote, ἐν τοῖς Ἑβραίοις τῇ ἰδίᾳ διαλέκτῳ αὐτῶν γραφὴν ἐξήνεγκεν εὐαγγελίου; and Papias, Ἑβραΐδι διαλέκτῳ τὰ λόγια συνεγράψατο (Euseb. *H.E.* III. 39). Of Mark Irenaeus said ὁ μαθητὴς καὶ ἑρμηνευτὴς Πέτρου (cf. III. 10. 6, *interpres et sectator Petri*). καὶ αὐτὸς τὰ ὑπὸ Πέτρου κηρυσσόμενα ἐγγράφως ἡμῖν παραδέδωκε; and Papias, ἑρμηνευτὴς Πέτρου (ὃς πρὸς τὰς χρείας ἐποιεῖτο τὰς διδασκαλίας) ὅσα ἐμνημόνευσεν ἀκριβῶς ἔγραψεν. Eusebius (*H.E.* III. 39) describes Papias as σφόδρα σμικρὸς τὸν νοῦν, says "he recorded many things that came down by oral tradition, viz. some strange parables and teachings of the Saviour and other things of a rather

the attendant of Paul, recorded in a book the Gospel preached by him. And then John, the disciple of the Lord, who also reclined upon His breast, he too published (ἐξέδωκε) the Gospel during his residence in Ephesus. These all proclaim one God the Creator, and one Christ, the Son of God. Any one who refuses to believe these truths despises the *companions of the Lord*, nay, he despises Christ Himself and the Father." In III. 11. 8, he describes the different characters of the Gospels of Christ as represented by the four-faced (τετραπρόσωπα) cherubim. "For the first living creature was like a lion, a symbol of His force, leadership and royalty; the second like a calf, an emblem of His sacrificial and sacerdotal order; the third had the face of a man, a very clear description of His appearance among us; while the fourth was like a flying eagle, signifying the gift of the Spirit Who descends as in flight upon the Church. The Gospels were in harmony with these types; for upon them Christ is seated. The Gospel according to John explains His regal and glorious generation from the Father, saying, 'In the beginning was the Word,' and 'All things were made by Him, and without Him was nothing made.' But the Gospel according to Luke, seeing that it is of a priestly character, commenced with

mythical character, among the latter, the statement that there would be a period of a thousand years after the resurrection, and that the Kingdom of Christ would be set up in a material form upon the earth. This was owing to his not perceiving that the things recorded by the Apostles in figures were mystically spoken. It was through him that so many churchmen after him adopted this opinion, as for instance Irenaeus." Irenaeus gave a description of a marvellous vine in v. 33. 3 where he says ταῦτα δὲ καὶ Παπίας ὁ Ἰωάννου μὲν ἀκουστής, Πολυκάρπου δὲ ἑταῖρος γεγονώς, ἀρχαῖος ἀνήρ, ἐγγράφως ἐπιμαρτυρεῖ ἐν τῇ τετάρτῃ τῶν ἑαυτοῦ βιβλίων. ἔστι γὰρ αὐτῷ πέντε βιβλία συντεταγμένα. The title of the books was Λογίων Κυριακῶν Ἐξηγήσεις. Irenaeus himself used the expression κυριακῶν λογίων probably a reminiscence of Papias in I. 8. 1. It was evidently from him that the tradition came that our Lord was nearly fifty years old.

Zacharias the priest offering sacrifice to God....Matthew again records His human generation, beginning, 'A book of the generation of Jesus Christ, the Son of David, the Son of Abraham,' this is the gospel in human form; but Mark commences with the prophetic spirit, which came down from on high to men, saying, 'A beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ as it is written in Isaiah the prophet[1],' thus showing forth a winged figure of the Gospel. Accordingly, he cast his Gospel in a condensed and cursory[2] form, for that is the prophetical style. And the Word of God Himself was wont to converse in all His Divine glory with the patriarchs before Moses: but for those under the law he appointed a sacerdotal ministry: afterwards having become man, He sent forth the gift of His Holy Spirit into all the world, placing us under the shadow of His wings. The order followed by the Son of God is thus represented by the form of the living creatures. And the character of the Gospel corresponds therewith, for as the living creatures were four in form, the Gospel of the Lord has four aspects and His work four stages. Therefore four catholic covenants were given to the race of man; the first, of Noah, being that of the rainbow at the flood; the second, of Abraham, being that of circumcision; the third was the giving of the law in the time of Moses; and the fourth is that of the Gospel through our Lord Jesus Christ. They are therefore foolish who introduce either more or fewer

[1] Irenaeus would have done well to remember his own rules about pauses in reading. His punctuation here is manifestly wrong. "In Isaiah the prophet" is read by ℵ. B. D. L. Δ. *edd.* R. and the Syriac, A. and *edd.* A. V. "in the prophets." So Irenaeus in III. 10. 6 and III. 16. 2, "in prophetis," showing that there was some doubt about the passage. Harvey suggests that in this passage Irenaeus quoted with the Syriac version in his mind.

[2] παρατρέχουσαν, cursory, Lat. *praecurrentem*, introductory.

forms of the Gospel[1] in order to pretend that they have discovered more than the truth or in the desire to set aside the dispensations of God." With regard to these remarks on the "four" Gospels, we cannot fail to see the influence of the mystic interpretation of numbers which was popular in his day. Numbers and cosmological speculation may have played a part in the formation of the Canon as in other things. For instance, in the Jewish work *Sepher Yetsirah* the substance of Creation was represented by the numerals, and the form by the twenty-two letters. In III. xi. 1 he says that "John, the disciple of the Lord, wrote his gospel to confute the error which was spread by Cerinthus and the Nicolaitans before him, who asserted that the Creator was different from the Father of our Lord; that the son of the former was different from the upper Christ who remained impassible, but who descended upon Jesus the Son of the Creator, and again returned to his Pleroma; that Monogenes was the beginning[2], and that Logos was the son of Monogenes; and that this world of ours was not made by the principal deity but by a certain power under compulsion from above which was cut off from all communication with the invisible world. Desiring to have such views refuted and to establish in the Church the 'rule of truth,' that there is one God Almighty Who made all things visible and invisible by His Word, he thus began his Gospel teaching[3], 'In the beginning was the Word, etc.'"

[1] Ziegler, *Ir. Bischof v. Lyon* (6. 99): "In Irenaeus we have not only the new religion of the Gospel, but the written Gospels, the documents thereof, placed beside the Old Testament, with full consciousness, as the independent source and document of the Christian religion and employed with the same form of citation as was customary with the Old Testament, e.g. III. 16. 2, "Spiritus Sanctus per Matthaeum ait."

[2] ἀρχὴ was a distinctive name of Μονογενής.

[3] "in ea quae est secundum Evangelium doctrina," lit. in that doctrine

Irenaeus throws a valuable light on the other books of the New Testament. He is the first to mention the *Acts*, which he cites as the composition of St Luke[1]. Several incidents in the travels of St Paul, some occurring in the "we-sections," are described in the Treatise, and it is asserted that St Luke, "who was present and carefully noted down these things (diligenter conscripsit et cum omni diligentia III. 15. 1) cannot be accused of falsehood or exaggeration," and that "if any one rejects Luke as one who knew not the truth, it is clear that he also sets aside the Gospel of which he claims to be a disciple and which adds important facts[2]." He cites a number of the facts connected with our Lord's mission which are only found in this Gospel, and which were used by Marcion and Valentinus (quibus et Marcion et Valentinus utuntur). He also described Luke as a colleague of the Apostles, and chiefly of Paul[3].

which is according to his Gospel, meaning that the preface of the Gospel was a summary of a doctrine it contained.

[1] III. 13. 3, III. 15. 1, "per Lucam...testificationi ejus quam habet de actibus et doctrina Apostolorum, omnes sequentes." Dr Harnack in *Luke the Physician* maintains the Lukan authorship of the "we-clauses." "The we-sections have about them the character of a diary, and it is therefore probable, if not certain, that St Luke employed in them notes which he possessed. In these sections, however, there is no certain indication of later interpolation" (*Acts of Apostles*, Harnack Eng. Trans. p. 231). Cf. "If St Luke the Physician is the author of the Acts the question of sources is simply and speedily settled for the whole second half of the book" (op. cit. p. 162). In the conclusion of this work Harnack gives praise to St Luke as the historian of the Church, saying, "If these heroes (SS. Peter and Paul) had found no historian, it is highly probable that in spite of Marcion we should have had no New Testament; for in the Catholic Church the combination of the isolated Pauline Epistles with the Gospel would have been an impossibility. Accordingly St Luke is really the creator of the Apostolic, side by side with the Evangelic tradition" (p. 301). Irenaeus, III. 14. 1, describes Luke, inseparabilis fuit a Paulo et cooperarius ejus in Evangelio...non solum prosecutor (ἀκόλουθος?) sed et cooperarius Apostolorum maxime autem Pauli.

[2] III. 14. 3, see III. 15. 1.

[3] See preceding note.

The Pauline Letters

Dr Werner in his work *Der Paulinismus des Irenäus* gives an interesting account of the use of the Pauline Epistles in Irenaeus, and states that Irenaeus is the witness of the fully commenced process of the canonization of these letters but not of the completion of the process[1]. Irenaeus indeed quotes a great number of passages taken from these Epistles. Of the 1065 quotations from the New Testament 324 are from them, 84 being from Romans[2]; 102 from 1 Cor.; 18 from 2 Cor.; 27 from Gal.; 37 from Eph.; 13 from Phil.; 18 from Col.; 2 from 1 Thess.; 9 from 2 Thess.; 5 from 1 Tim.; 5 from 2 Tim.; 4 from Titus. Of these Dr Werner selects 206 as direct Pauline citations to be distinguished from the others which had become the common property of the Church. The manner in which these passages are cited by Irenaeus throws a light upon the growth of the Canon. For instance, in his citations of the two Epistles to the Corinthians, which are very numerous from the first but comparatively few from the second, he generally gives the author and address without distinction of number; e.g. he cites with name and address passages from 1 Corinthians in IV. 38. 2, "Therefore Paul says to the Corinthians"; in IV. 37. 7, "Paul, an Apostle, says to the Corinthians"; in III. 18. 2, "And again writing to the Corinthians he says"; in V. 11. 1, "as again the Apostle himself testifies, saying to the Corinthians." But in IV. 26. 4, "So Paul made his defence to the Corinthians" begins a passage from

[1] p. 214.
[2] But there is no citation from the fifteenth chapter.

2 Corinthians ii. 17. The two letters are also confused in v. 13. 3 and 4. In three passages, III. 11. 9; III. 13. 1; IV. 27. 3, he gives a citation from the first Epistle to the Corinthians, which he describes as "that letter which is to the Corinthians." He cites the letter as if there were but one. So Clement of Rome in I. 47 says: "Take up the letter of the blessed Paul," referring to 1 Cor. It is true that in I. 8. 2 and V. 7. 2, he speaks of the *first* Epistle to the Corinthians, and in III. 6. 5, IV. 28. 3, V. 3. 1 and V. 13. 3, we have references to the *second* Epistle to the Corinthians. But in the last passage he quotes eight times from these two Epistles (four times from each), as if they were the same letter. It is quite possible that the Scriptural references in other passages are due to the Latin translation. This may prove that in the collections that lay before Irenaeus the first and second letters to the Corinthians were not distinguished. This might be an argument in favour of the view that 2 Cor. x.—xiii. might also be an independent Epistle attached to 2 Cor. i.—x. On the other hand, the Greek and Latin mention the *letters* to Timotheus[1] which he quoted as the work of St Paul. The case with regard to 1 and 2 Thess. is the same. In IV. 27. 4, he cites 2 Thess. i. 6—10 as if it belonged to an only letter, describing it as "in that letter which is to the Thessalonians."

The same confusion is found in the citations from the Johannine Epistles, e.g. in III. 16. 5 he cites 1 John ii. 18, and in III. 16. 8 he refers to this, writing, "John

[1] III. 3. 3, ἐν ταῖς πρὸς Τιμόθεον ἐπιστολαῖς, the reference being to the mention of Linus in 2 Tim. iv. 21. Cf. III. 14. 1, ipse Paulus manifestavit in epistolis dicens Demas me dereliquit (2 Tim. iv. 10, 11). He quotes Titus iii. 10 in III. 3. 4, with introduction "quemadmodum Paulus ait," in I. 16. 3, with the words, "quos Paulus jubet." He recognized the Pauline authorship of the Pastoral Epistles.

in the above mentioned letter," but citing 2 John 7, 8. And then, in the very next sentence, he goes back to the first Epistle as if it had been before him all the time, and then refers to the Gospel (i. 14) and again to the first Epistle (v. 1).

With regard to the form of citation, generally speaking, the Greek text of Irenaeus corresponds to the Greek of the New Testament. The six quotations from the pastoral letters show, however, a considerable divergence, a phenomenon which Mr Harvey explained as due to an acquaintance with a Syriac translation of the Greek original[1]. There are also interesting divergences between his citations from other Epistles and the Greek text, chiefly the reading *πράξεων*[2] (suggested by *factorum*) for *παραβάσεων*[3], in III. 7. 2.

These passages are quoted by Irenaeus as possessed of the highest authority; e.g. in II. 22. 2, et dies nominatur et a propheta (Isaiah) et a Paulo; in IV. 32. 1, quemadmodum et Moses ait (Gen. i. 3)...et in evangelio (John i. 3) legimus...et apostolus Paulus (Eph. iv. 5) similiter; in IV. 33. 11, Adventus Domini de quo Ipse ait (Lk. xviii. 8)...de quo et Paulus ait (2 Thess. i. 6); de quibus et Ipse Dominus ait (Mt. xxv. 41)...et apostolus autem similiter ait (2 Thess. i. 9, 10). In these passages St Paul is coordinated as an authority not only with the Old Testament and the Gospel but also with our Lord. As compared with Polycarp's use of the Pauline[4] letters

[1] In I. 16. 3 and III. 3. 4, the Greek text has the correct reading of Titus iii. 10, but in the latter passage the Latin through the influence of the Old Italic version omits "and second." So Tertullian *De Praesc.* 6.

[2] This is due to the influence of the Old Italic version. "Factorum" is read in the St Germain copy of the N.T.

[3] Gal. iii. 19.

[4] 1 Thess. in *Ad Philipp.* c. 4; 2 Thess. in c. 11; Gal. in c. 5; 1 Cor. in c. 11; 2 Cor. in c. 2; Rom. in c. 3; Eph. in c. 12; Phil. in c. 3; 1 Tim. in c. 12; 2 Tim. in c. 5.

of which nine at least were employed by him, but of which the title and address are nowhere given; and with Justin's, who does not mention either author or source, although he occasionally drew from them[1], Irenaeus attaches a greater importance to these letters, just as he does to the New Testament in general, which seems to have been only the second authority with Justin, the Old Testament in the Greek version being more prominently used in his argument. Polycarp indeed assumes a knowledge of these letters, introducing a quotation of 1 Tim. vi. 7 in his letter (c. 4); and of Eph. ii. 8, 9, in c. 1, with the word "knowing" (εἰδότες); and referring to "the wisdom of the happy and glorious Paul" and his letters in c. 3 bids his people study (ἐγκύπτητε) them that so they may be built up in the faith. Irenaeus assigns great weight to these letters, appealing to the very words to establish a doctrine, or to confute a heresy, e.g. in III. 16. 9, Rom. v. 17, regnabunt per *unum* Jesum Christum is cited against the Gnostic division of Jesus and Christ; in III. 18. 3 his argument for the real suffering of Jesus Christ is based on Rom. xiv. 15; Eph. ii. 13; Gal. iii. 13; 1 Cor. viii. 11, "Significans quoniam non Christus impassibilis descendit in Jesum, sed Ipse, Jesus Christus cum esset, passus est pro nobis." In III. 16. 9 he states that St Paul "foreseeing through the Spirit the schismatical attempts of evil teachers made the foregoing remarks." In the fourth book (41. 4) he promises to deal more fully with the doctrine of St Paul, "conscriptioni huic in sequenti *post Domini sermones* subjungere Pauli quoque doctrinam, et examinare

[1] E.g. *Cohort. ad Graecos*, p. 40, used Gal. iv.; *Apol.* i. 29, *Dial.* 253, 258, 338, 307 employs 1 Cor.; *Dial.* 244, Rom. iii.; *Dial.* 310 et sq. Col.

sententiam ejus, et Apostolum exponere"; and in the Preface to the fifth book he fulfils this promise, saying, "in hoc libro quinto...ex reliquis doctrinae Domini nostri et ex apostolicis epistolis conabimur ostensiones facere," treating the Pauline letters as a constituent part of the N.T. Canon. It is true that in II. 30. 7 he seems to exclude the Pauline letters from "the universal scriptures," writing "quoniam enim sunt in caelis spiritales conditiones universae clamant scripturae et Paulus autem testimonium perhibet." But in II. 28. 2 after referring to the "universae scripturae" he immediately quotes 1 Cor. xiii. 13 in proof of his assertion.

Irenaeus has a curious way of combining different passages in his quotations from these epistles. For instance in IV. 37. 4 we have a blending of Eph. v. 8 and Rom. xiii. 13, "quasi filii lucis honeste ambulate," and of 1 Cor. vi. 11 to conclude with, "et haec quidem fuistis, sed abluti estis, sed sanctificati estis" etc. In IV. 12. 2 he begins with Rom. xiii. 10 and then gives an irregular arrangement of different verses from 1 Cor. xiii. quoted indirectly. In V. 7. 2 we have a blending of 1 Cor. xv. 42, 36 and 1 Cor. v. 43; in IV. 27. 2 one of Rev. xi. 21 and xi. 17; in IV. 37. 4 one of Eph. iv. 29 and Eph. v. 4. These examples on one hand show the literal accuracy of the citations, and on the other the independent use Irenaeus made of the Pauline text. Mr Harvey assumes that he quoted from memory. That he did this at times is very probable. This would explain his passing from one passage to another called up in his mind by some similarity in expression. On the other hand, the literal agreement of such long passages as in V. 11. 1 where Gal. v. 19—23 and 1 Cor.

vi. 9–11 are quoted, with the Greek text would be scarcely possible as a feat of memory.

Dr Werner builds his theory that Irenaeus never appeals to any collection of Pauline letters as a second constituent of the New Testament Canon, upon the fact that Irenaeus does not use in his quotations from the Pauline letters the introductory formula "'the Scripture,' neither does he employ for these letters any title corresponding to 'the Gospel,' the official title of the writings regarding our Lord[1]." But the use of *Scriptura* (γραφή) and *Scripturae* (γραφαί) is too vague or loose in Irenaeus for the building up of any argument. For instance, the Gnostic writings are styled *Scripturae* in I. 20. 1; in III. 3. 3, the Epistle of the Roman Clement is styled *Scriptura*[2], and in II. 28. 7 our Lord's own teaching is treated as distinct from *Scriptura*, which there, as in many other places, refers to the Old Testament; "neque Scriptura aliqua retulit, nec apostolus dixit, nec Dominus docuit," a threefold authority covered by the immediately preceding *Scripturae*. The Old Testament books are "*divinae Scripturae*[3]"; proofs from them are "*ex Scripturis*." Compare also IV. 26. 1, "si quis legat Scripturas inveniet in iisdem de Christo sermonem," and III. 21. 3 "ex his Scripturis" (LXX.) etc. But when promising to give proofs from the Gospels in II. 35. 4 he describes the latter as *Scripturae dominicae* and *divinae*, also in II. 30. 6, V. 20. 1 etc. And yet in III. 1. 1 he speaks of

[1] *Der Paulinismus des Irenäus*, p. 41, Während also die A. T. Citate solenn mit "Scriptura ait" eingeführt werden, auch solche aus Schriften des neuen Bundes mit diesen und ähnlichen Formeln bei den Evangelien dieselben bereits durch den gleich solennen Titel Evangelium verdrängt sind, findet sich nicht ein einziges Paulus Citat in solenner Einführungs-Form. Keines dieser 206 Citate ist als "Scriptura ait," oder ähnlich eingeleitet.

[2] ex ipsa scriptura; a little above ικανωτάτην γραφήν (Lat. potentissimas literas).

[3] III. 19. 2.

those who handed down the *Gospel* in the *Scriptures* (*in Scripturis*) and says that Matthew published a Scripture or writing of the Gospel[1]. In III. 19. 2 Scripturae is used as the equivalent of *prophetae omnes et apostoli*, which includes the Gospels, for in III. 11. 9 he distinguished *Apostolorum*[2] *Evangelia* from Valentinus' *Veritatis Evangelium*. He also speaks of the Gospels which come from the Apostles, where the apostolic writings are treated as equivalent to the Gospels; and in III. 1. 1 he writes of the third Gospel, "and Luke the follower of Paul recorded in a book the Gospel which was preached by the latter[3]," evidently regarding St Paul's Evangel among the *Apostolorum Evangelia*. And in I. 6. 3 we have a quotation from Gal. v. 21 ascribed to the Scriptures[4]. Dr Werner suggests that Irenaeus here cited the Pauline letters as "Scriptures" because they were regarded as such by the Gnostics[5]. The converse of this statement is even more probable, namely that the

[1] III. 1. 1, *γραφὴν Εὐαγγελίου* (scripturam Evangelii).

[2] He does not mean that all the Gospels were written by the Apostles, for he points out, III. 1. 1, that Luke and Mark were not Apostles, but delivered respectively the Gospels preached by Paul and Peter.

[3] Cf. Tertullian, *Adv. Marc.* IV. 5, "Nam et Lucae digestum Paulo adscribere solent."

[4] de quibus Scripturae confirmant quoniam *qui faciunt ea Regnum Dei non haereditabunt*.

[5] Epiphanius (*Haeres.* 42. 9, p. 310) says that Marcion used the Gospel of St Luke and ten Pauline Epistles, viz. those to the Galatians, Corinthians (2), Romans, Thessalonians (2), Ephesians, Colossians, Philemon, and Philippians, also some fragments of the letters to the Laodiceans. He says that Marcion removed some chapters of these letters and altered others. The Gnostics justified their theories by an unwritten tradition and the Pauline epistles. This appeal no doubt gave greater publicity to these writings and caused Churchmen to make a supreme effort to reclaim them and to use them in refuting the positions of the Gnostics. In this way the Gnostics were "hoist with their own petard." See Epiphanius (loc. cit.) *ἐξ οὗπερ χαρακτῆρος τοῦ παρ' αὐτοῦ σωζομένου, τοῦ τε εὐαγγελίου καὶ τῶν ἐπιστολῶν τοῦ ἀποστόλου, δεῖξαι αὐτὸν ἐν θεῷ ἔχομεν ἀπατεῶνα καὶ πεπλανημένον καὶ ἀκρότατα διαλέγξαι.* See also Rothe, *Vorlesungen* I. 135. Werner, op. cit. p. 44.

Gnostics used the Pauline Epistles because they were considered authoritative with Church people. But the personal authority of the Apostle Paul had sufficient weight with Irenaeus, irrespective of the consideration in which he was held by the Gnostics, to warrant the importance attached in the treatise to his Epistles. For example, after citing in III. 12. 9 St Paul's words, Acts xiv. 15–17, he says: "We shall show from his Epistles that all his Epistles agree with these announcements," and he calls such proofs, proofs "ex Scripturis." Accordingly, we find that, if he does not refer to any collection of Pauline letters as standing on the same level with the Four Gospels, he seems to have given to the Pauline letters a place of importance second only to that of the Gospels, one of which was St Paul's own Gospel. The fact, therefore, that the formula "the Scripture saith" is not found in connection with any Pauline citation, but rather such forms as "as the Apostle says," does not weaken our contention. For Irenaeus' order of authority is "the Lord, the Apostles, and the prophets[1]," the Apostles, among whom was St Paul, ranking next to "our Lord," even if the word "scriptura" is more generally reserved for the Old Testament, e.g. III. 6. 2, "scriptura apud David," V. 21. 2, "nulla dicebat scriptura," etc. The Pauline Epistles were popular in various parts of Christendom in his day. For instance, the Scillitan Christians in Africa, in the year A.D. 180 (Coss. Praesente et Claudiano), when asked what books they possessed, said, "Books and epistles of St Paul, a just man[2]." Irenaeus refers in III. 7. 1 not to the

[1] III. 17. 4, "As the Lord Himself testifies, and the Apostles confess, and the prophets announce," in II. 35. 3, "Apostolorum dictatio et legislationis ministratio" the Apostles are put before the Old Testament.

[2] Robinson, *Texts and Studies*, I. 112—116. Libri et epistulae Pauli

neglect of the Pauline letters, but to the faulty elocution of public readers[1].

Of the fourteen Epistles all save that to Philemon are cited by him. Philemon is referred to by Tertullian (*Adv. Marc.* v. 21) as accepted by Marcion. Epiphanius, as we have seen above, expressly stated that *Philemon* was one of Marcion's ten letters. Neither is there any quotation from the last two chapters of the Epistle to the Romans. But every chapter of the Epistle to the Colossians is represented, chiefly the first, which touches the cosmical relation of the universe to Christ. Citations from the Pastoral Epistles, which he recognized as Pauline, have been given. To these may be added the reference to Linus[2] in III. 3. 3, and to baptism, the laver of regeneration[3], in v. 15. 3. With regard to the Epistle to the Hebrews, Eusebius[4] states that Irenaeus was the author of a book containing several treatises, in which he mentioned the Epistle to the Hebrews and the Wisdom of Solomon, quoting passages from both. Photius, however, held that Irenaeus declared against the Pauline authorship[5]. Origen said its style was more Hellenic, while the thoughts were not inferior to the acknowledged writings of St Paul[6]. The Epistle was a favourite of

viri justi. "Libri" may stand for the Gospels. One may not argue from this answer that the Pauline letters were not yet fully canonical.

[1] ne quidem Paulum legere sciunt.

[2] 2 Tim. v. 21. [3] Titus iii. 5.

[4] *H.E.* v. 25, cf. VI. 13, where he says that Clement of Alexandria used certain of the *Antilegomena*, the so-called Wisdom of Solomon, that of Jesus Son of Sirach, and the letter to the Hebrews, etc.

[5] Stephanus Gobarus (on Photius cod. 232) says that Hippolytus and Irenaeus denied the Pauline authorship of the Epistle. See Kirchhofer, *Geschichte des N.T. Canons* p. 240 "Photius fand in Hippolytus *Kirchengeschichte* die Angabe: ἡ πρὸς ἑβραίους ἐπιστολὴ οὐκ ἐστι τοῦ ἀποστόλου Παύλου."

[6] Eusebius *H.E.* VI. 25. Origen seems to have wavered a good deal. He has 200 quotations from this epistle, which are sometimes introduced

Clement of Rome, and is frequently used in his own letter[1]. There are a few allusions to this letter in the treatise, e.g. in II. 30. 9 we have "by the word of His power" Heb. i. 3; "faithful Moses the servant and minister of God," an echo of Heb. iii. 6, in III. 6. 4; "the heavenly altar" of IV. 18. 6, which seems to be a reminiscence of Heb. xiii. 10 "We have an altar." The translation of Enoch is mentioned in V. 5. 1, but this may not be derived from Heb. ii. 5, and the law is described in IV. 11. 4 as a "shadow of the things to come," as in Heb. x. 1. It is quite possible that Irenaeus knew the letter well but was reluctant to use the authority which the Montanists had claimed for their views founded on Heb. vi. 4, 5.

With regard to the Catholic Epistles, Bishop Westcott[2] hazarded the statement that "he (Irenaeus) makes no reference whatever to the Epistles of St James, St Jude, 3 John, 2 Peter." But we find a reference to James ii. 23 in IV. 16. 2, "He believed God, and it was counted unto him for righteousness and he was called the friend of God"; and in V. 1. 1 "Nor could we have learned in any other way than by seeing our Teacher and hearing His voice, so that having become imitators of His works as well as *doers of His words*, we may have communion with Him, even we who were made the *first-fruits of the creation*," we have echoes of two passages of this Epistle, I. 18 and I. 22. In the Latin of V. 23. 2 we find the misquotation from 2 Peter iii. 8: "the day of the Lord

by the words, "Paul in the letter to the Hebrews," e.g. *in Joh.* t. 2 (*Opp.* IV. 60).

[1] See cc. 9, 10, 12, 17, 19, 36, 45, 56, etc. Eusebius *H.E.* III. 38 judging from the similarity of style and subject-matter between the two letters says it is not improbable that Clement translated the letter originally written in Hebrew into Greek.

[2] *Bible in the Church*, p. 123.

is as a thousand years," which is found in V. 28. 3 in the Greek—"the day of the Lord is as a thousand years"; the Greek of the New Testament being "one day with the Lord is as a thousand years[1]."

The passages from 1 Peter in this treatise are chiefly interesting as already showing variations in the text of Irenaeus. This of course may be the result of quotations from memory or the caprice of the Latin translator. 1 Peter i. 12: "which things angels desire to look into," is quoted in the two different ways, "into which (*in quae*) angels desire to look[2]," and "whom (*quem*) angels desire to see[3]." Feuardent and Erasmus, following the Clermont MS., read *in quem* in the first of these passages, Massuet and Harvey "*in quae.*" Quem may point to another Greek reading. Again, 1 Peter i. 8 "Whom not having seen ye love, in Whom, though now ye see Him not, yet believing, ye rejoice greatly with joy unspeakable," is presented in a double form. Compare the form in IV. 9. 2 with that found in V. 7. 2. Three passages from this Epistle are translated literally, i.e. 1 Peter ii. 16, ii. 22, and 23. There is, indeed, no reference to 3 John, but the letter from the Presbyter to the Elect Kyria is expressly cited as the work of the beloved disciple in III. 16. 8. His version of 2 John 7 and 8 contains interesting variations: "They went forth," instead of "are entered"; "*ye lose* what ye have wrought," instead of "*we lose* what we have wrought[4]," which is the reading of the Authorized, as the former is that of the Revised Version. In his citation of 1 John iv. 1, 2, 3, in III. 16. 8,

[1] ἡ γὰρ ἡμέρα Κυρίου (Irenaeus), μία ἡμέρα παρὰ Κυρίῳ (Peter).
[2] II. 17. 9. [3] V. 36. 3.
[4] exierunt: ἐξῆλθον so ℵ, A, B, *edd.* R., WH., Vg.: A.V. εἰσῆλθον; *perdatis* quod operati estis ℵ, A, R., and Vg.: A.V. ἀπολέσωμεν. The second epistle is not in the Syriac. The reference is to III. 16. 8.

preserved only in the Latin, his text exhibits interesting variations, e.g. "qui solvit Jesum," he who annulleth Jesus, instead of "he who confesseth not Jesus[1]." Tertullian has the expression "solventes Jesum," annulling Jesus, in *Contra Marc.* c. 16. But Polycarp in his letter to the Philippians cites the passage as we have it. Finally, Irenaeus writes in a Greek passage cited by Epiphanius, I. 16. 3: "For John, the disciple of the Lord, increased their condemnation, desiring us not even to bid them 'God speed,' for he who bids them 'God speed' is partaker of their evil deeds[2]."

In one of the fragments attributed to Irenaeus by Pfaff we have in the expression "faith delivered unto the saints" a reminiscence of the third verse of the Epistle of Jude. This fragment, however, appears to be spurious. And in IV. 36. 4, the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrha is described as an "example of the righteous judgement of God," a blending of Jude 7 and 2 Thess. i. 5.

A valuable testimony to the Revelation of St John is found in this treatise, where several passages are cited from the Apocalypse of John, "Domini discipulus," e.g. V. 35. 2 and V. 26. 1. He has an interesting discussion on the number of the Beast in V. 30. 2, for which he suggests Euanthas, Lateinos and Teitan as solutions[3].

[1] Annulleth: λύει for μὴ ὁμολογεῖ, confesseth not. The former has the support of many Fathers, Vg., R. marg., WH. marg. ℵ has in addition Χριστὸν ἐν σαρκὶ ἐληλυθότα. So Polycarp *Ep. to Phil.* 7; omitted by A. B. *edd.* R. Socrates *E. H.* 7. 32 says, "in the first catholic epistle of John it was written 'Every Spirit that separates (λύει) Jesus is not of God.' The mutilation of this passage is attributable to those who desired to separate the Divine nature from the human economy."

[2] 2 John ii.

[3] In Greek notation. In V. 30. 1 he says that 666 is the reading of Rev. xiii. 18 in all the ancient and genuine MSS. but that some wrongly have 616 without authority, owing to some mistake, caused perhaps by reading ι for ξ, viz. χιϛ′ for χξϛ′. C alone among MSS. now known has 616, which may be the right reading. Irenaeus was impressed by the fact

With regard to the date of the Apocalypse he says that "it (or he) was not seen so long ago, but in our generation, toward the end of the reign of Domitian." Professor Swete, in *Apocalypse*, p. 95, quotes this as the earliest of authorities to prove that "early Christian tradition is practically unanimous in assigning the Apocalypse to the last years of Domitian." The Bishop of Ely[1] has, however, pointed out that Dr Hort suggested to him that John himself, and not the Apocalypse, is the subject of ἑωράθη (was seen). Irenaeus employed the same verb ὁρᾶν of his own personal knowledge of Polycarp[2]. The Latin translation, "qui et Apocalypsim viderat. Neque enim ante multum temporis visum est[3]," supports this view, for "visum est" is most probably a corruption of "visus est," and cannot agree with "Apocalypsis." But on the other hand, a strained meaning is given to "visum est[4]." This would imply the earlier date, the Neronian, for the Apocalypse, which is advocated by Lightfoot, Westcott and Hort. Canon Sanday, however, supported the later date[5]. Irenaeus may have brought his veneration for the Apocalypse to the West, for we find it treated as "sacred Scripture" by the Churches of Lyons and Vienne. Dionysius of Alexandria, the pupil of Origen, in a masterly criticism, which elicited the admiration of Bishop Westcott, was the first to point out the difference of character (ἦθος), language and ideas between

that in 666 there are the same number of hundreds, decades and units. However, Nero Kaisar makes 616, and Neron Kaisar 666 (in Hebrew notation).

[1] *Journal of Theological Studies*, 1907.

[2] III. 3. 4, ὃν καὶ ἡμεῖς ἑωράκαμεν ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ ἡμῶν ἡλικίᾳ.

[3] V. 30. 3.

[4] The passage V. 35. 2, "John *saw* it (Jerusalem) descending in the Apocalypse," is also against John being the subject of *visum est*.

[5] In his later preface to Dr Hort's *Apocalypse* he is inclined, however, to recede from this position.

the Apocalypse and the Gospel, and to suggest a difference of authorship[1].

We have seen that Irenaeus was familiar with all the books of the New Testament save two. Many of his readings, which may have come into his text through the influence of the old Latin versions, however, do not agree with the readings of our principal MSS. and form, therefore, an interesting but a special study in themselves. His exposure of the extreme biblical critics of his day makes his work very valuable in the present time.

Gnostic Canons and Exegesis

Irenaeus' remarks on the Gnostic canons and exegesis of Scripture are also invaluable in view of the work which is assigned to them in the formation of the Christian canon by Dr Harnack[2]. It is evident that the Gnostics attempted to establish their positions by scriptural proofs, and deliberately altered the Gospels and Epistles to suit their purposes. We learn from Tertullian[3] that it was a truncated gospel of St Luke that Marcion used. We have already referred to his employment of the Pauline Epistles. It is quite possible that he published the text of his *Evangelium* and *Apostolicum* about the year 150 A.D. Tertullian appears to have had both before him[4]. In

[1] Eusebius *H.E.* VII. 25.

[2] *Dogmengeschichte* I. 187, where he says that it is difficult to decide whether Basilides, Valentinus or Marcion first grasped the idea of a Christian Canon, but that many things point to Marcion. He also says of the Gnostics, "So sind die die ersten Christlichen Theologen" (*ibid.* s. 188).

[3] *de carne Christi*, c. 2.

[4] *Adv. Marc.* IV. 1, "Ad ipsum jam *Evangelium* ejus provocamus, quod interpolando suum fecit." *Ibid.* III. 17, "ipsum Marcionis evangelium discuti placet." *Ibid.* IV. 4, "si negaverint Marcionitae primam apud nos fidem ejus adversus *epistolam* ipsius."

I. 27. 2 Irenaeus fully described Marcion's treatment of the Scriptures which finds a modern parallel in certain of the biblical articles in the *Encyclopaedia Biblica.* There he says: "Marcion mutilated the Gospel according to Luke, removing all the passages that referred to the virgin birth of our Lord, and much of His teaching in which it is written that He called the Maker of this universe His Father. He also persuaded his disciples that he was more veracious than the apostles who handed down the Gospel, not giving them the Gospel but a portion of the Gospel. In like fashion, he cut down the letters of the Apostle Paul, removing all that that apostle had said about the God Who made the world being the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, and also the passages foretelling the advent of our Lord which that apostle had quoted from the prophets." In a remarkable passage[1] he gives the following résumé of the work of the advanced critics of the second century. "Marcion rejected the Gospel in its entirety; indeed, he cut himself altogether adrift from the Gospel, and yet he boasts that he has a share in the Gospel[2]. Others[3], in order to set at naught the gift of the Spirit, which was poured out in recent times upon the human race, do not accept the form of the Gospel which is according to John, in which the Lord promised the advent of the Paraclete, but equally reject the Gospel and the Spirit of prophecy."

Irenaeus added that "they (the Montanists) also

[1] III. 11. 9, cf. the similar charge of Tertullian in *De Carne Christi*, and in *De Praescriptionibus*.

[2] partem Evangelii. Massuet reads pariter, which has not as good authority, as Marcion boasted that he had the *whole* Gospel, when he had only a part, but *Evangelium* here refers to Gospel blessings.

[3] The Montanists.

repudiate the Apostle Paul[1] because in his Epistle to the Corinthians he refers to prophetic gifts." But the Valentinians differ from others, stating boldly that they have more gospel than ours, "and have reached such a pitch of irreverence that they style their newly discovered Gospel the evangel of truth, although it has nothing in common with the Gospels of the Apostles, so that not even is the Gospel among them free from blasphemy." We might compare with these assumptions of the Gnostic schools of criticism some of the positions that are adopted in the modern work referred to. One writer (Schmidt of Zurich) reduces the Gospel narrative to a collection of unauthenticated stories, strung together in the interests of a religious idea, and leaves the student a few "authentic" sayings of Jesus. Another (Professor W. van Manen) denies the Pauline authorship of any of the Epistles attributed to St Paul.

Such treatment of Holy Writ is the same in principle and practice as that of Marcion and his school, "who set about the work of revising the Scriptures, and refusing absolutely to acknowledge some books and striking out portions of the Gospel of Luke and the Pauline Epistles, declared that what they had thus curtailed was alone authentic, 'legitima[2]'." The Gnostics also displayed their critical caprice in using "a number of apocryphal and spurious writings which they have themselves composed with a view to confound the foolish and those who know not the elements of the truth[3]." But Irenaeus, employing the argument *ad hominem*, answers them out of the

[1] Clement of Alexandria (*Str.* III. 442 etc.) also complains of the misuse and mutilation of the Scriptures by the heretics.

[2] III. 12. 12.

[3] I. 20. 1, τὰ τῆς ἀληθείας γράμματα in sense of "knowing one's letters."

portions they accept. "This foundation of the Gospels," he says, "is so sure, that even the heretics bear witness to them, and starting from them, each one attempts to establish his own views. For the Ebionites, who only use the Gospel according to Matthew, are proved from the same not to teach the true doctrine of our Lord. But Marcion, mutilating the Gospel according to Luke, is proved to be a blasphemer against the only true God by the passages he retains. While if they who separate Jesus from Christ, and hold that Christ continued impassible while Jesus suffered, would only read the evangel of Mark which they prefer, they would, if they really desire to know the truth, be corrected by it. The school of Valentinus, which makes abundant use of the Gospel according to John, will also be proved by that Gospel to be altogether in the wrong[1]."

The Gnostics also followed a method of criticism which has again come into use and which consists in finding facts to suit certain presuppositions rather than that of building theories upon the data. As Irenaeus says: "They endeavour to adapt the parables of our Lord, the sayings of the prophets and the words of the Apostles to their own peculiar theories, in order that their scheme may have support. In this matter they disregard the order and connection of the Scriptures and dismember the truth as far as they can. By inserting passages in a wrong context, and giving them a different form and changing one thing into another, they deceive many, cunningly making the *oracles of the Lord* correspond with their own absurd theories[2]."

The Gnostics also held peculiar views of Apostolic

[1] III. 11. 7. [2] I. 8. 1.

exegesis and inspiration, declaring that the Apostles accommodated their doctrine to the capacity of their hearers, and that the sources of prophetical inspiration were many and various. "They, who are the most worthless of all Sophists, say that the Apostles accommodated their doctrine to the capacity of their hearers, and made their answers agree with the opinions of their questioners, speaking blind words with the blind, answering the languid after their languor and fools after their folly, announcing the Demiurge or Creator as the only God to those who so thought, but for those who hold that the Father is not to be named, devising an ineffable mystery in parables and enigmas[1], so that they, the Apostles, did not exercise the functions of their teaching office in truth, but compromised it in every case." "And the others, who are falsely called Gnostics, who maintain that the prophets uttered their prophecies under the inspiration of different Gods, are easily silenced by the fact that all the prophets announce one God and one Lord, even the Maker of heaven and earth[2]." Again he writes in IV. 35. 1, "The school of Valentinus and the other Gnostics declare that certain passages of Scripture were spoken from the highest place; that others were delivered from the intermediate place, while many portions proceeded from the Creator of the world by Whom the prophets were sent. But we say it is very absurd to reduce the Universal Father to such a state of need that He should have no agencies of His own through whom the matters relating to His Pleroma might be correctly known."

Irenaeus also protests against the esoteric doctrine and reserved manner of the Gnostics, which were so

[1] III. 5. 1. [2] II. 35. 3.

different from those of the Apostles. "Whereas the Gnostics privately unfold to those they have perverted the ineffable mystery of the Pleroma[1]"; and "lay claim to greater knowledge concerning everything than others, reading from unauthorized documents" (*ἐξ ἀγράφων ἀναγινώσκοντες* I. 8. 1), "the doctrine of the Apostles is open and fixed, naught is reserved from the pupils, but everything is public[2]." "For the Apostles without reservation or distinction of persons delivered to all what they had been taught of God[3]." On the other hand, the Gnostics are plausible, as well as exclusive, and "when a man has been won over to their views of salvation, he straightway becomes so full of conceit and importance that he imagines he is no longer in heaven or earth, but that he has already passed into the Pleroma, and struts about proudly and loftily with a coxcomb air, as if he had already embraced his angel[4]."

In the Preface to the first book and in IV. 35. 3[5] he also refers to the air of profound wisdom with which they mystified their adherents and concealed their own

[1] III. 15. 2. [2] III. 15. 1. [3] III. 14. 2.

[4] III. 15. 2, cum institorio et supercilio incedit gallinacei elationem habens (cf. Demosthenes, *contra Cononem* § 9 *ἤδε γὰρ τοὺς ἀλεκτρυόνας μιμούμενος τοὺς νενικηκότας*).

[5] et uno eodemque sermone lecto, universi obductis superciliis agitantes capita, valde quidem altissime se habere sermonem dicunt, non autem omnes capere magnitudinem ejus intellectus, qui ibidem continetur, cf. I *Praef.* *τὰ τερατώδη καὶ βαθέα μυστήρια ἃ οὐ πάντες χωροῦσιν ἐπεὶ μὴ πάντες τὸν ἐγκέφαλον ἐξεπτύκασιν*. This is ironical, cf. Tertullian, *C. Val.* I., "Si bona fide quaeras, concreto vultu, suspenso supercilio, 'Altum est' aiunt." Cf. *Merchant of Venice* I. 1. 88 et sq.

> There are a sort of men whose visages
> Do cream and mantle like a standing pond,
> And do a wilful stillness entertain
> With purpose to be dress'd in an opinion
> Of wisdom, gravity, profound conceit,
> As who should say, "I am Sir Oracle,
> And when I ope my lips let no dog bark!"

ignorance, saying when asked a question, "It is too deep for ordinary brains." The cryptic and mysterious allusions to a deeper teaching and a hidden knowledge, which are so alluring to students of oriental theosophy in our day, are, accordingly, but part of the ancient scheme of Gnosticism, invented to secure adherents of the best type by attracting seekers after truth.

CHAPTER XIII

NOTES OF THE CHURCH

At the outset it is necessary to protest against the reading of Early Church history through the spectacles of German criticism. It is unjust to charge the Post-Nicene Church, which did so much to preserve the Scriptures, with suppressing the genuine writings of the sub-apostolic age with the exception of those of Ignatius and the pseudo-Dionysius, because they were not in accordance with her change of views. She cannot be proved to be guilty of the desire to place the *Syntagma* of Justin, the works of Hegesippus, Hippolytus, Rhodon, Melito, and a host of other Church writers which have perished, and her own *Church Orders*, on an Index Expurgatorius. It cannot have been her wish either that the Greek of Irenaeus should have been lost. The scantiness of Early Church literature is not due to the hostility of the Church, but to the conditions of an age unfavourable to the composition and preservation of writings[1].

In the history of the Church, as in the history of every institution, the critical follows the creative stage. Things exist before theories. The establishment precedes the discussion of its *raison d'être*. So it was with the

[1] If the writings of Porphyry and other Neo-platonic enemies of Christianity were destroyed by an order of Theodosius how many Christian writings were destroyed previously by pagan Emperors?

Church. She was there before men thought of considering her claims. And her book, the New Testament, was there before men attempted to reduce its doctrines to system. Opposition without and sedition within compelled Churchmen to concentrate their attention upon their faith, to take heed to their lines of defence, to "walk about Zion and go round about her, to tell the towers thereof and mark well her bulwarks."

Such was the phase of Church life in the days of Irenaeus, which by no stress of imagination can be described as a "revolution[1]," but was rather a transition from the sub-conscious or subliminal state to the fully self-conscious existence of organized life. The Church was now awakening to her position and privileges as well as to her Divine charter, character and faith.

In one sense the Church was old, in another new. As "the seed of Abraham" it was for Irenaeus the continuation of the Jewish Church, having obtained the inheritance and adoption promised to Abraham[2]; it is also "the great and honourable body of Christ[3]." In IV. 33. 8, he describes the "ancient constitution of the Church universal," and "the character of the body of Christ maintained by successions of the bishops[4], to whom they (the Apostles) entrusted the Church which is in each place, and which has come down to us with its safeguard of the Scriptures in the fulness and soundness of their interpretation[5]." Here he maintains the

[1] Harnack, *History of Dogma*, Eng. Trans. II. 77.

[2] IV. 8. 1; V. 34. 1, semen ejus quod est ecclesia.

[3] IV. 33. 7, τὸ μέγα καὶ ἔνδοξον σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ, cf. St Paul, Eph. iv. 12.

[4] "successiones episcoporum" but "successiones presbyterorum," III. 2. 2; "successiones episcoporum," III. 3. 1; he also speaks of the "presbyters before Anicetus."

[5] custodita sine fictione scripturarum tractatione plenissima.

historic episcopate on one hand, and sound Bible teaching on the other, as the preservatives of the unity and continuity of the Church. The Church is founded on the Scriptures which it maintains. "The Gospel is the pillar and foundation of the faith[1]," and "the pillar and foundation of the Church are the Gospel and the Spirit of life[2]." The Churches are the guardians of the apostolic tradition[3]. "The Church is the depository of the truth[4]," in which we have "the communication of Christ, that is, the Holy Spirit[5]." "Seeing that we have such proofs," he says, "it is not necessary to seek among others for that truth which is in the Church. For the Apostles trusted her most fully with all that pertains to the truth, just as a rich man deposits his money in a bank, so that every one may draw from her the water of life. For she is the entrance to life[6]."

He rings the changes on the unity of the Church's faith. "The preaching of the Church is true and constant. For she proclaims everywhere one and the same way of salvation. She has in trust the light of God, and so the "wisdom" of God by which she saves all men is declared in her going forth. For the Church trumpets forth the truth in every direction, and is the lamp with the seven burners that carries the light of Christ[7]." "Nor will any of the elders of the Church, no matter how eloquent, preach other doctrines than these[8]." In III. 24. 1, he insists on the continuity of the Spirit's work in the Church as the secret of her unity. "It has been shown," he says, "that the teaching of the Church is everywhere[9]

[1] III. 1. 1. [2] III. 11. 8. [3] III. 2. 2. [4] III. 4. 1.
[5] III. 24. 1. [6] III. 4. 1. [7] V. 20. 1.

[8] I. 10. 2, *προεστώτων*. Cf. Justin Martyr, ὁ *προεστώς* the officiating or presiding elder. *Apology* 65. 1.

[9] Clerm. reads "utique," for "ubique"? Cf. the Vincentian canon, quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus.

uniform and abiding, and is supported by the testimony of the prophets, Apostles and all the disciples, as we have proved, from the beginning, through the middle unto the end, right through the whole course of the dispensation of God and the ordered plan of salvation which is expressed in our faith, which has been received from the Church, which is maintained by us, and which is renewed by the Spirit of God, just as a beautiful plant when beginning to flower throws the bloom of its youth over the very pot in which it grows[1]." "The gift of God," he continues, "has been entrusted to the Church, as breath was given to man, to this end that all members receiving it might have life, and in her has been deposited the means of communion with Christ, that is, the Holy Spirit, the pledge of incorruption, the assurance of our faith and the 'altar-stairs that slope to God[2].'" "For in the Church, he saith, God hath set apostles, prophets and teachers and all the other channels through which the Spirit works, whereof they do not partake who have left the Church. For where the Church is there is the Spirit of God, and where the Spirit of God is there is the Church and every form of grace, for the Spirit is truth[3]."

The Church is apostolic, and the continuity of its apostolic descent is also the safeguard of the apostolic faith. "Suppose," he says, "a dispute arose over some small point, should we not be obliged to refer the matter to the most ancient churches with which the Apostles held intercourse, and thus find out what is clear and

[1] quasi in vase bono eximium quoddam depositum juvenescens et juvenescere faciens ipsum vas in quo est. depositum = παρακαταθήκη, deposit, 2 Tim. i. 14.

[2] scala ascensionis ad Deum.

[3] III. 24. 1, 1 Cor. xii. 28.

certain from them[1]?" "For all these (Gnostics) made their appearance long after the bishops to whom the Apostles entrusted the churches[2]." "Wherefore it is right to obey the presbyters who are in the Church, who, as I have shown, have the succession from the Apostles, who together with the succession to the episcopate possess the charisma of truth[3]," and "to whom the Apostles committed their own position in the government of the Church[4]." With these passages compare Tertullian, *De Praes.* 16—21, who is equally firm on the continuity of the Church and the apostolicity of her orders and her faith. This continuity of orders is a safeguard both for the unity of the Church and the correctness of her belief in the eyes of Irenaeus. See III. 12. 7, where he asserts that "the Church which is throughout the whole world, and has its firm origin from the Apostles, maintains one and the same opinion with regard to God and His Son," whereas the heretics hold many conflicting views. And in V. 20. 1, contrasting the many paths of the heretics with the one path of the Church, he thus indicates the six points of union in the ancient Church: (1) All have received one and the same God the Father, and (2) believe in one and the same economy of the Incarnation of the Son of God and (3) are conscious of the same gift of the Spirit, (4) practise the same precepts, (5) teach the same scheme of salvation in all the world, and (6) maintain the same form of ecclesiastical system[5].

One in descent and doctrine, the Church is also one in hope and love. For all who belong to her look

[1] III. 4. 1. [2] V. 20. 1. [3] IV. 26. 1.
[4] suum ipsorum locum magisterii, III. 3. 1.
[5] Eandem figuram quae est erga ecclesiam *ordinationis*. Grabe sees reference to *ordination*.

forward to the same advent of our Lord and await the same salvation of soul and body[1]. And the Church has one supreme gift, that "love which is more precious than knowledge, more illustrious than prophecy, and more excellent than all other gifts[2]." "Among the heretics exist error and foolish conjuring (*magica phantasia*) before the eyes of men, but in the Church mercy and pity, steadfastness and truth, for the help of man without fee or favour, we ourselves spending and being spent in the service of others[3]."

Another note of the Church is *Catholicity*. He describes four catholic covenants in III. 11. 8, the first under Adam, the second under Noah, the third under Moses, and the fourth that of the Gospel, through our Lord Jesus Christ. In IV. 36. 2, he says: "The glorious Church is everywhere, and everywhere the winepress is digged, because they who receive the Spirit are everywhere." All classes are admitted to the mysteries of the Church. "The doctrine of the Apostles is open and constant, naught is reserved, nor is one set of doctrines preached in public and another held in secret[4]." He relates how the School of Valentinus in their addresses to the crowd introduced certain remarks for the benefit of those they called "ordinary church people" (*communes ecclesiasticos*), saying that their doctrine is the same as ours and that we have no reason to abstain from their communion[5].

Another note is *sanctity* or personal holiness. This is indispensable in a presbyter. While urging us to

[1] V. 20. 1. [2] IV. 33. 8. [3] II. 31. 3. [4] III. 15. 1.
[5] III. 15. 2, "communes" may represent *καθολικούς*, the Latin word not yet having come into use. Harvey suggests that the name of Catholic may have been applied first to the Church of Christ by the Gnostics in contempt.

avoid the arrogant ones, he advises us to "adhere to those presbyters who maintain the apostolic doctrine, have the order of priesthood (*cum presbyterii ordine*), are blameless in speech and manner of life, and are a good example to others[1]." Such presbyters the Church nourishes. To such the prophet refers when he says, "I will give thy rulers in peace and thy bishops in righteousness." In IV. 26. 5, he sums up the notes of the Church and her teaching. "Where the gifts of the Lord have been deposited there we must learn the truth. There too is the apostolic succession of the Church, and there too is sincerity and integrity of life, purity and incorruptibility of speech. For they guard their own faith in one God Who made all things, they foster that love we have for the Son of God, Who appointed such dispensations for our sake, and they expound the Scriptures without hurt to our souls, without blasphemy toward God, and without dishonour to either patriarchs or prophets." He enjoins obedience to such[2].

In IV. 33. 9, he describes the testimony of the Church, which she sealed with her blood, in words that recall Tertullian's saying, "The blood of the martyrs is the seed of the Church." "Wherefore the Church, because of her love of God, sends forth a great army of martyrs to the Father in every age. The heretics, on the other hand, who can show nothing like this, go so far as to say that such testimony is unnecessary; for, as they affirm, their tenets are their true witness."

His cold pen seems to glow with indignation when he writes of those who break up the unity of the Church.

[1] IV. 26. 4.
[2] IV. 26. 1, eis qui in ecclesia sunt presbyteris obaudire oportet.

See IV. 26. 2, and IV. 33. 7[1]. He declares that the destruction that schism works is incalculable and incurable. As for those who have made it, "they wallow in every error, frequently changing their opinions because they have not been founded upon the one rock, but on the sand that has many pebbles[2]." See also V. 20. 2, "varie et multiformiter et imbecille facientes iter." In III. 11. 9, summing up his case against them, he declares that they have committed the unpardonable sin. "The heretics bring strange fire, that is, strange doctrine, to the altar of God, and shall be consumed by fire, as Nadab and Abiud were. They who rise against the truth and put others against the Church of God are to be swallowed up like Dathan and Abiram, and they who cleave asunder the unity of the Church shall be punished as Jeroboam (IV. 26. 1)." He thus distinguishes between heretics and schismatics. These words were written by one who had not only a great affection for his own people, many of whom had been led astray by false and unauthorized teachers, but also a great love for the truth which was contained in the Scriptures that were in the custody of the Church. Therefore he says, "to avoid their tenets and escape their evil influence we must take refuge in the Church, be educated in her bosom, and be nourished upon the Scriptures of the Lord" (V. 20. 1).

[1] IV. 26. 2, qui scindunt et separant unitatem ecclesiae eandem quam Hieroboam poenam percipiunt a Deo; IV. 33. 7, qui schismata operantur, qui sunt inanes, non habentes Dei dilectionem, suamque utilitatem potius considerantes quam unitatem ecclesiae; et propter modicas et quaslibet causas magnum et gloriosum corpus Christi conscindunt et dividunt, et quantum in ipsis est, interficiunt; pacem loquentes et bellum operantes: vere liquantes culicem et camelum transglutientes. How very true is all this in the history of schism and sectarian jealousy!

[2] III. 24. 2.

Harsh as this language seems to us, it has often been exceeded in the wars of controversy, religious and political, and against it is to be set the eulogy on charity, the *praecipuum dilectionis munus*[1]. Penned not in malice but in zeal for what he believed to be the truth, it is not to be imitated by those who have been taught not to love their Church less but Christ more. Neither should the "odium theologicum" which, indeed, is not peculiar to theology but is common to all studies, deter men from the study of these controversies in the Early Church or cause them to deviate from the ordinary laws of evidence and common-sense in that study.

[1] IV. 33. 8, quod est pretiosius quam agnitio, gloriosius autem quam prophetia, omnibus autem reliquis charismatibus supereminens.

CHAPTER XIV

THE MINISTRY

Continuity and Orders

THE unbroken line of bishops in the Church, Irenaeus repeatedly says, is the test and safeguard of apostolic doctrine. Apostolic descent is the guarantee of the uniformity of belief. It is more reasonable that the truth should be found among those who can trace back their ministerial descent and doctrine to the Apostles than among a new and irregularly formed sect, who set aside the very Scriptures and tradition of the Apostles, boasting that they are correctors of the Apostles[1]. They are not ashamed to preach their own Gospel, corrupting the rule of truth, and declare that the Scriptures are "of no authority," when against their views[2]. The heretics have appealed to tradition, answers Irenaeus; then let them be judged by "that tradition which has its origin from the Apostles and has been preserved by a regular succession of presbyters in the Churches." But when so challenged, "they declare they are wiser than the presbyters, and even than the Apostles[3]," an interesting

[1] III. 1. 1.

[2] III. 2. 1, semetipsum praedicare non confunditur, *lit.* to preach himself.

[3] III. 2. 2.

instance of the authority of private judgement in those days.

The historic continuity of Church tradition, on the other hand, has been safeguarded through the ages by an unbroken line of presbyters. This argument has only weight in our time with those who appreciate the claims of antiquity and believe that water is purest when nearest its source. But in those days it was an effective argument. There was a tremendous force in the challenge of Tertullian:—"Let them show a list of bishops, proceeding in succession from the beginning in such a way that their first bishop had as his authority and predecessor some one of the Apostles or of the apostolic men, who were associated with the Apostles[1]," and in the statement of Irenaeus: "All these (heretics) are of far more recent date than the bishops to whom the Apostles entrusted the Churches[2]."

With regard to this unbroken line of presbyters or bishops—for Irenaeus regards all bishops as presbyters, though he does not treat all presbyters as bishops—he declares that "we can enumerate those who were appointed by the Apostles to be bishops in the Churches and their successions down to our own times[3]." As it would be tedious in a work of such size to enumerate the successions in all the Churches, he deems it sufficient to point out the "apostolic tradition and faith of the very great and very ancient and well known Church founded and established at Rome by the two most glorious Apostles, Peter and Paul, which has been brought down to us by the successions of the bishops." By this means he hoped to put to silence all "who for

[1] *De Praescript.* 32. [2] v. 20. 1.
[3] III. 3. 1. Clerm. and Ar. MSS. read *successiones* for *successores*.

one reason or another, vanity, self-will or blindness, held unauthorized meetings." He then proceeds to speak of the *potentior principalitas* of that Church. Whatever this means, it cannot mean sovereign authority[1] (*αὐθεντία*). Irenaeus himself lectured Victor, and he recognized as mother city of the Church not Rome but Jerusalem[2]. Neither did Polycarp yield one inch to Anicetus, who treated him as an equal. The Church of Rome had, indeed, an excellent name in the second century. Her prestige lay not, however, in her bishop or his authority, but in her own orthodoxy and apostolic seat. By reason of her association with imperial Rome, her connection with the Apostles, her freedom from heresy, her liberality, organization and wealth, the Church of the "Eternal City" enjoyed considerable influence in those days. Ignatius describes her as "president in love," and Clement as "president of truth." Foremost in every good work, she was naturally the premier Church in those days before she fell into error, and therefore the most influential. But as Rome had not yet attempted to exercise any control over other Churches with success, *principalitas* can hardly be rendered by any term stronger than prestige or dignity. All the communities founded by the Apostles, the *principes*, (Ps. 67. 26 Vg.) had a certain *principalitas* or leading position[3], while Rome in virtue of other things enjoyed a *potentior principalitas* which is not equivalent to the Greek *ἀρχή* jurisdiction, but rather to *πρωτεῖον*, which

[1] *Pace* Dr Harnack, l.c. 157, who appeals to Tertullian, *Adv. Valent.* 4, ab ecclesia *authenticae* regulae abrupit, and Victor's remark, origo *authentici* apostolatus.

[2] III. 12. 5. *αὗται φωναὶ τῆς μητροπόλεως* (i.e. Jerusalem) *τῶν τῆς καινῆς διαθήκης πολιτῶν*; the reference being to Acts iv. 24—28.

[3] Cf. Benson's *Cyprian*, p. 527 et sq.

occurs in 3 John 9, "Diotrephes who loveth to have the *pre-eminence*" (φιλοπρωτεύων)[1]. The other difficulty in the passage is the meaning of "convenire." The text is: "For with (*ad*) this Church, which holds a leading position among the Churches, it is right that every Church, that is, the orthodox who are everywhere (*undique*), should *convenire*," that is either *conform* or *meet*? The fact that all roads led to Rome, that she was mistress of the highways of the empire, that she was most hospitable to strangers, that many bishops in the early centuries took journeys to Rome, leads to the literal interpretation, but Harnack declares such to be "inadmissible[2]," and Harvey translates "should agree[3]."

The list of early Roman bishops which Irenaeus gives may possibly have been founded on the work of Hegesippus. Hegesippus was an older contemporary of Irenaeus. Eusebius[4] quotes from his *Memoirs*, in which he states that he made a voyage to Rome, and when there, "made a list of the succession down to Anicetus, whose deacon was Eleutherus." He (presumably Hegesippus) then adds: "And to Anicetus succeeds Soter, after whom Eleutherus." Anicetus was bishop A.D. 156—167, and Eleutherus A.D. 175—189. It is a remarkable coincidence that both lists conclude with Eleutherus, and that the verb διαδέχεται, succeeds, is used of Soter by Hegesippus, and its participle διαδεχομένου, succeeding, by Irenaeus, who had used no verb with his three predecessors, Hyginus, Pius, and Anicetus.

[1] Deane, *Third Book of Irenaeus*, Clarendon Press, p. 6, "Principalitas = ἀρχή not πρωτεῖον." Is this correct?

[2] l.c. p. 158.

[3] Cf. II. 24. 4, in nullo *communicans* argumento eorum, nec *concurrens* figmento eorum, nec *conveniens* eis, all in sense of *agree*.

[4] *H.E.* IV. 22.

There appears to have been some confusion in the lists, for in I. 27. 1, Hyginus is distinctly stated to be the *ninth bishop*, and in III. 4. 2, he is expressly called "the *eighth bishop*." This may be due to the inclusion of the Apostles in one list and their omission in the other. Irenaeus takes it for granted that the Apostles St Peter and St Paul founded the Church of Rome, but no point in Church history is wrapped in so much obscurity as the origin of the Roman Church. The list of the Roman bishops given in III. 3. 3, is as follows: "Linus, mentioned by Paul in the letters to Timothy, Anacletus, Clement, who had seen and met the Apostles, and might be said to have their preaching still ringing in his ears and their tradition before his eyes. While this Clement held office a grave dispute arose among the brethren at Corinth, and the Church of Rome sent a most appropriate (*ἱκανωτάτην*) letter to the Corinthians, urging them to have peace....Clement was succeeded by Evarestus, Alexander, Sixtus, Telesphorus, Hyginus, Pius, Anicetus, Soter and Eleutherius, the twelfth in succession from the Apostles who now holds office." "By this order and succession," he says, "the apostolic teaching and preaching of the truth has come down to us" (III. 3. 3). He also refers to the apostolic character and foundation of the Churches of Smyrna and Ephesus. "Polycarp," he writes, "who had been instructed in the faith (*μαθητευθείς*) by the Apostles, and had the advantage of conversing with many who had seen the Lord, was also appointed bishop of the Church in Smyrna by the Apostles; whom we saw in our early youth, for he lived to a great age[1]." "Polycarp sent a most suitable (*ἱκανωτάτη*) letter to the Philippians." Irenaeus also

[1] III. 3. 4, *ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ ἡμῶν ἡλικίᾳ.*

appeals to the Church in Ephesus, which was founded by St Paul and where St John remained until the days of Trajan, as an equally staunch witness of the apostolic tradition. He evidently regards the three apostolic foundations on the same footing, giving, however, the chief place to the See of Rome. His omission of the episcopal lists of Smyrna (which he should have known) and Ephesus confirms the view that the Roman list was borrowed from Hegesippus, who obtained it from Anicetus, and it cannot, therefore, be allowed much weight.

He appeals to the fact that the whole Church maintains the tradition of the Apostles, and the same faith in God the Father, the Son and the Divine Spirit; observes the same precepts and guards the same form of Church order *eandem figuram ejus quae est erga Ecclesiam ordinationis*[1] in V. 20. 1, where Grabe considers that there is an allusion to the ordained ministry. In IV. 33. 7, he refers to the apostolic doctrine and the ancient Church system which is throughout the whole world (*τὸ ἀρχαῖον τῆς ἐκκλησίας σύστημα*). And he recognized as Pauline the Pastoral Epistles, regarding which Dr Liddon said: "In our days, the question of Episcopacy is increasingly seen to be bound up with that of the apostolic origin and authority of the Pastoral Epistles[2]."

These things show that Irenaeus was a firm upholder of law and order in the Church and of the historic episcopate. His use of the word "presbyter," however, is broad, and was intended to apply to bishops as well as priests. For while he regarded every bishop as a

[1] But see cui ordinationi assentiunt multae gentes = Church order, III. 4. 1.

[2] *A Father in Christ*, p. 14.

presbyter, it cannot be shown that he looked upon every presbyter as bishop. Linus, he says, held the office of the episcopate[1]. To the bishops the Apostles entrusted the Churches[2], even their own seat of administration[3]. In the succession of bishops the character of the Body of Christ is manifested[4]. They who were entrusted with the Churches also received the *ordo traditionis*, the order of tradition from the Apostles[5], and therefore the true tradition is found in every Church because "we can enumerate those who are appointed as *bishops* in the Churches and their successors down to ourselves[6]." In IV. 26. 5, he writes: "Such *presbyters* doth the Church nourish, of whom the prophet speaketh, 'I will give thy rulers in peace and thy *bishops* (ἐπισκόπους) in righteousness[7].'"

But, on the other hand, he refers to those who maintain the doctrine of the Apostles and possess with priests' orders (*cum presbyterii ordine*) a sound form of speech and life[8]. In V. 5. 1, he appeals to the teaching of the presbyters, the disciples of the Apostles, who may or may not have been bishops. In V. 20. 1, he describes the heretics as calling in question the teaching of "the holy presbyters," just after he had spoken of "the bishops to whom the Apostles entrusted the churches." In

[1] III. 3. 3, *τὴν ἐπισκοπὴν κληροῦται.* [2] V. 20. 1.

[3] suum ipsorum locum magisterii. II. 3. 1.

[4] IV. 33. 8, character corporis Christi secundum successiones Episcoporum.

[5] III. 4. 1. But in III. 2. 2 he says this tradition is guarded by the *successions* of the *Presbyters* in the churches.

[6] III. 3. 1.

[7] Is. lx. 17, after LXX. The Hebrew *Noges* (נֹגֵשׂ) is used of the Egyptian taskmasters or overseers Ex. iii. 7, v. 6; in Dan. xi. 20 of a raiser of taxes, of a tyrant in Is. iii. 12, xiv. 2, and here Fuerst compares the Ethiopic *negus*, the title of the old Ethiopic kings.

[8] IV. 26. 4.

IV. 22. 1, he recommends the laity to study the Scriptures under the tuition of the presbyters who have the apostolic doctrine. In IV. 26. 2, he speaks of the presbyters in the Church, who have their succession from the Apostles, and who, with their succession to the episcopate, have received the grace of truth[1]. He also makes mention of the "presbyters before Anicetus" and the "presbyters before Soter," and "the successions of the presbyters[2]," and in V. 36. 2 of "the presbyters, the disciples of the Apostles," meaning *bishops* in each case. On the strength of these passages Bishop Wordsworth[3] remarks that "St Irenaeus, writing about A.D. 180, still uses the terms presbyter and bishop as interchangeable." But Irenaeus must have experienced in his own case the distinction between the presbyterate and the episcopate. As presbyter, he was sent on a deputation to Rome, and, as bishop, Pothinus suffered under the Romans, who regarded the bishop, and not the presbyter, as the representative of the Church. After the martyrdom of Polycarp, Irenaeus, as bishop, discharged the episcopal duty of exhorting and convincing the gainsayers with sound doctrine[4]. This "rooting out of the thicket of heresies" was, according to Hilary the Deacon, the author of the distinction "every bishop is a presbyter, but every presbyter is not a bishop," the point which differentiated the bishops from the presbyters[5]. And in III. 14. 2 Irenaeus seems to distinguish between bishops and presbyters. There, describing St Paul's interview with the Ephesian elders of Acts xx. 17, he says: "Paul summoned

[1] qui cum episcopatus successione charisma veritatis acceperunt.
[2] III. 2. 2, per successiones presbyterorum.
[3] *Ministry of Grace*, p. 127. [4] Titus i. 9.
[5] *In Titum* i. 5. See *Ministry of Grace*, p. 122.

to Miletus the bishops and presbyters[1] who were in Ephesus and the neighbouring states...and said 'Attend to yourselves and to all the flock in which the Holy Spirit placed *you* as *bishops*, to rule[2] the Church of God.'" St Luke had merely recorded the summoning of the presbyters[3], but in his speech St Paul said, whether addressing all the presbyters or a certain number of them we cannot tell, "in which the Holy Spirit placed *you* as *bishops*" (ἐπισκόπους *v.* 28). Irenaeus appears to have felt the difficulty of presbyters being addressed as bishops, and to prevent any further misunderstanding, he informed his readers that the bishops were summoned as well as the presbyters. He also referred to the *ruling* power which he must have known was in his days in the hands of the bishop.

V. 20. 1, where he speaks of the preservation of the form of Church *ordination*, is interesting in the light of Tertullian's remarks about the disorderly ordinations of the heretics[4], "A man who is a bishop to-day will not be a bishop to-morrow," etc.

It is not within our scope to discuss the relation of the *presbyteri* to the *episcopi*, but it is worthy of mention that Irenaeus[5] used the word "president" (ὁ προεστώς) used by Justin Martyr of the consecrating elder[6], and writing of the presbyters in IV. 26. 5 he quotes Is. lx. 17: "I will give thy rulers in peace and thy *bishops* (ἐπισκόπους) in righteousness" differently from Clement, who in his letter to the Corinthians[7] says: "I will establish

[1] convocatis episcopis et presbyteris.
[2] regere (Lat.): so Vg. Greek ποιμαίνειν.
[3] πρεσβυτέρους. Vg. seniores natu. Acts xx. 17.
[4] *De Praes.* c. 41. Grabe refers figuram...ordinationis to the ordained ministry; Harvey to the general constitution of the Church.
[5] I. 10. 2, τῶν ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις προεστώτων.
[6] *Apol.* 65. [7] c. 42.

their bishops, ἐπισκόπους, in righteousness and their deacons in faith." The Latin interpreter in the same passage renders the word "steward" (οἰκονόμος) of Luke xii. 42, confused with Mt. xxiv. 45, by *actor* or agent, the Roman title for the legal representative of a corporation[1]; and Gaius (*Digest*, III. 4. 1) makes mention of *actor* in connection with the *arca communis*. Bishop Wordsworth writes: "Probably, therefore, Dr Hatch is right when he suggests that the word 'bishop' is rather borrowed from the Greek secular associations in which ἐπίσκοπος or ἐπιμελητής was a frequent title for the overseer or treasurer who invested the funds of the Society and decided on their distribution[2]." Against this, however, we have the LXX. use of the word, which may have suggested it to the Christian Jews.

Charismatic Ministry. In IV. 26. 5, Irenaeus refers to the general charismatic ministry of the "apostles, prophets and teachers," citing St Paul's words in 1 Cor. xii. 28. These we find at Antioch[3], while there was a more settled organization in Jerusalem, consisting of apostles, deacons and "masters of assemblies." The *Didaché* also speaks of an itinerating order of apostles and prophets. Irenaeus writes in the passage referred to: "Where the charismata of the Lord are placed there we must learn the truth, and such are to be found among those who have the Church succession from the Apostles[4]." He also claims for the presbyters, "who have succession from the Apostles, the charisma of truth[5]."

There are references to other charismata of a more

[1] Cf. Tertullian, *C. Marc.* IV. 29.

[2] *Ministry of Grace*, p. 120. The reference is to Hatch's *Organisation of the Early Christian Churches*, p. 37.

[3] Acts xiii.

[4] quae est ab Apostolis Ecclesiae successio. [5] IV. 26. 2.

transitory nature. In V. 6. 1, he writes: "We have also heard of many brethren in the Church having prophetical gifts (*prophetica charismata*), and speaking in all languages through the Spirit, bringing to light the hidden things of human life, for the advantage of men and explaining the mysteries of God." In II. 32. 5 he speaks of men exorcising demons, seeing visions, uttering prophecies, and healing the sick by the laying on of hands. And he seems to give his own personal reminiscences when he states that "even the dead have been raised and continued with us many years," evidently a reference to restoration after a long death-like faint or trance. He concludes by saying, "It is not possible to recount the host of graces which the Church through the whole world receives from God in the name of Jesus Christ, and which she uses daily for the welfare of the nations, deceiving none and taking no money" (*μήτε ἐξαργυριζομένη*). He also declares that "it is not by invocation of angels, nor by any other presumptuous act that she performs these works, but by having a pure mind and clean hands, and by honestly directing her prayers to the Lord Who made all things, and by invoking the name of our Lord Jesus Christ she wrought miracles for the weal of men and not for the making of proselytes." The recent movement of genuine faith-healing in the Anglican and American Churches is a proof that this charisma has not been taken from the Church, and, indeed, it is the best way to counteract the influence of Christian Science.

A few words remain to be said on the terms *clerus*, (*κλῆρος*), whence clergy, and *sacerdos*. The word *clerus* is used of a Church office in III. 3. 3, where we read that Eleutherus was the twelfth to hold the *office* (*κλῆρον*) of

the Episcopate. It is also implied in the same passage, where we read that Clement obtains (κληροῦται) the Episcopate. The use of the word is founded on the LXX. of Deut. xviii.—"Whose inheritance (κλῆρος) is God"; but we may see in it an indication of the growing distinction between the clergy and the laity.

The word *sacerdos* is connected with *clerus* or inheritance in IV. 8. 2, where David is described as a priest (*sacerdos*) appointed (*scitus*) of God[1]. He also says, "Every righteous king has sacerdotal rank[2]." This priesthood has not been annulled by the Master, Who Himself fulfilled the works of the High Priest (*summus sacerdos*), propitiating God for man, healing the lepers, and dying Himself that exiled man might return to his *inheritance*[3], "for all the Apostles of the Lord who have no *inheritance* here, but who serve the altar and the Lord continually, are priests (*sacerdotes*)." "For the Lord Himself is their inheritance[4]" (κλῆρος).

It would seem as if Irenaeus in this passage supported the idea afterwards put forward by Cyprian[5] that the Christian ministry performs the sacrificial functions and perpetuates the sacerdotal character of the Jewish priest-

[1] scitus from scisco, appoint.

[2] πᾶς βασιλεὺς δίκαιος ἱερατικὴν ἔχει τάξιν. In the Edessene Canons (25) there is a reference to the privilege of Christian Kings to go up and stand before the altar. Compare their privilege of presiding in a sacrosanct character at general councils. The consecrating, robing and anointing of our King at his coronation give a quasi-episcopal character to his office. The Kaiser has on one notable occasion acted as a bishop.

[3] IV. 8. 2. [4] Deut. xviii. 2.

[5] Archbishop Benson's *Cyprian*, p. 34. "For him the bishop is the sacrificing priest. Christ was Himself the Ordainer of the Jewish priesthood. The priests of that line were our 'predecessors.' The Jewish priesthood at last became 'a name and a shade' on the day when it crucified Christ. Its reality passed on to the Christian bishop...The presbyterate is the Levite tribe." See IV. 18. 3, hanc oblationem ecclesia sola puram offert... Judaei autem jam non offerunt, manus enim eorum sanguine plenae sunt.

hood. But the altar is no earthly one—but "is in heaven whither our prayers and oblations are directed[1]." Irenaeus did not regard Apostolic succession as the title-deeds of an exclusive hierarchy, but as the safeguard of the Scriptures, and of the Christian faith and ministry. He does speak of the Church in its corporate capacity offering its oblation to God[2]. But in the same connection he reminds us that "it is not sacrifices that sanctify the man, for God does not need sacrifice, but it is the conscience of him who offers that sanctifies the sacrifice, being pure, and so enables God to accept it as from a friend[3]." And therefore he says "it behoves *us* to make our offering to God with a pure mind, with faith unfeigned, with a firm hope, and fervent love[4]."

There is nothing mechanical or sacerdotal in this system. The organization and its representatives do not in any sense come between man and the Spirit of God or the Saviour. In no sense are the predicates of holiness and purity transferred from the individual to the institution. The holiness of the individual Christian, which he believed to be assailed by heretical sects, was the writer's concern. And if he believed that the ideal of personal holiness could be best realized by one who lived in a holy community connected by many visible and invisible links and ties with the Lord and His Apostles, and

[1] IV. 18. 6.

[2] IV. 18. 4, hanc oblationem Ecclesia sola puram offert fabricatori... cum simplicitate Ecclesia offert. These oblations cannot be identified with the sacrifice of the Mass, being described as consisting of God's own creature (sanctificantes creaturam IV. 18. 6) and our prayers and God being said "in se assumere bonas operationes nostras."

[3] IV. 18. 3, non sacrificia sanctificant hominem...sed conscientia ejus qui offert sanctificat sacrificium.

[4] in sententia pura et fide sine hypocrisi, in spe firma, in dilectione ferventi, cf. Tertullian *De Or.* 28; nos sumus veri adoratores et veri sacerdotes qui Spiritu orantes Spiritu sacrificamus orationem Dei propriam et acceptabilem.

associated with clergy of orthodox faith and blameless life[1] and established upon the Scriptures, he was but applying the principles of St Paul to the exigencies of the religious life of his times[2]. In his day the bishops were veritable "Fathers" of their people, desiring nothing but to lead them in spiritual things and safeguard them from spiritual and moral dangers. The position of Irenaeus with regard to the Episcopate could not perhaps be better summarised than in the words of Dean Church: "The Episcopate has these two things; it has a history inextricably associated with that of Christianity; and next, it is a public sign of community of origin and purpose, and an assertion, never faltering, of confidence in a continuing future....Only this has been everywhere where Christianity has been, only this belongs peculiarly to Christianity as a whole[3]."

[1] IV. 26. 3, adhaerere his qui Apostolorum doctrinam custodiunt et cum presbyterii ordine sermonem sanum et conversationem sine offensa praestant.

[2] 1 Cor. xii. 27, 28 "Now ye are the body of Christ and severally members, etc."; Eph. iv. 11, 12 "And he gave some to be Apostles...for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ"; *ibid.* v. 23 "Christ is the head of the Church: and he is the Saviour of the body"; iv. 16 "From whom the whole body fitly joined together...maketh the increase of the body unto the edifying of itself in love."

[3] *Pascal and other Sermons*, p. 105.

CHAPTER XV

THE SACRAMENTS OF THE CHURCH

Holy Baptism

THE word sacrament is used by the Latin interpreter in a broad sense for mystery in II. 30. 7 where St Paul is described as seeing in his vision spiritual mysteries, *sacramenta spiritalia*. Tertullian[1] also used the word in the same sense, i.e. "ejusdem sacramenti traditio."

As regards Holy Baptism, it is to be noted, amid the general obscurity of the subject, that in the time of Irenaeus Infant Baptism had become general. This practice was based by him upon the principle that in Christ every age of human life was virtually recapitulated and sanctified. See II. 22. 4, "He sanctified every age by the corresponding part of His own. For He came to save all through Himself, all, I say, who through Him *receive the new birth unto God*[2], infants and children, youths and their elders. Therefore He passed through every age, becoming an infant for infants, thus sanctifying infants, a child for children, sanctifying all such, and giving them an example of piety, and performance, obedience and righteousness." Irenaeus regarded Infant Baptism as highly proper, therefore, being truly based

[1] *De Praes.* 20. [2] renascuntur in Deum.

upon the Incarnation and leading to regeneration. Tertullian's objection to it was not that children cannot receive the grace of Baptism, but that it was advisable to defer the performance of the rite because of the responsibility it brought[1]. Origen insisted on it, because he regarded birth in itself as unclean, while Irenaeus regarded Baptism as a seal of the salvation of the body.

He sets forth the special grace of Baptism in many passages. See III. 17. 2 "Our bodies received unity with Christ through that laver[2] which leads to incorruption, but our spirits through the Spirit. Hence both are necessary, since both lead to eternal life." In III. 17. 1 he describes our Lord as giving the power of *regeneration unto God*[3] to His disciples, when He said, "Go, teach all nations," etc. In I. 21. 1 he said a certain class of heretics "were suborned by Satan to deny that Baptism which is a regeneration (*ἀναγέννησις*) unto God." In V. 15. 3 he writes: "And seeing that the man, so far as he took his origin from Adam, was made in transgression and needed the *laver of regeneration*, the Lord said to him after He had anointed his eyes with clay, 'Go to Siloam and wash,' thus restoring to him his perfect form and that *regeneration which is through the laver*." "Foolish are they who despise the universal economy of God and deny the salvation of the flesh and its regeneration, calling in question its capacity for incorruption[4]."

Compare Justin Martyr's *Apology*[5], "No one is allowed to partake of the Eucharist unless he believes the articles of our faith and has been washed in the

[1] pondus Baptismi. *De Bapt.* c. 18.

[2] lavacrum = *λοῦτρον*, cf. Tit. iii. 5, cited in V. 15. 3, lavacro regenerationis.

[3] Cf. Acts viii. 19, "Give me also this power (*ἐξουσίαν*) that he on whom I lay my hands may receive the Holy Spirit."

[4] V. 2. 2. [5] c. 66.

laver for the remission of sins and for regeneration" (*ἀναγέννησιν*).

It is a matter of regret that Irenaeus did not throw more light on the procedure of the Early Church in Baptism. However, Tertullian[1] speaks of the renunciation made in the church under the hand of the bishop (*antistes*), the answer of those (adults) who were to be baptized, the trine immersion, the cup of honey and milk, and the sponsors[2]. According to him, the bishop[3] (*summus sacerdos*) has the right to give Baptism, and when authorized by him, the priests and deacons, for the honour of the Church.

Baptismal regeneration is further defined by Irenaeus, indirectly, it is true, in a passage bearing on the work of the Holy Spirit in Baptism, as the entrance to life[4]. The use of the Latin *renascuntur in Deum*, formed after the Greek "baptizing *into* the Name[5]"; the reference to the Baptismal commission; the mention of God's preserving the race of Adam *by the type of the ark*[6]; the mention of the Baptism of Jesus for the remission of sins[7]; and of the laver of regeneration in connection with Baptism, are sufficient evidence that he held a special grace of Baptism. Indeed, we may say that his views

[1] *De Corona Militis*, c. 4. [2] *De Baptismo*, c. 18.

[3] *De Bapt.* 17, summus sacerdos qui est episcopus. Irenaeus IV. 8. 2 says of Christ, summi sacerdotis opera perficiens propitians pro hominibus Deum. Bishop Wordsworth in *Ministry of Grace*, pp. 80, 156, mentions that it was "a peculiarity of the Church of Milan that no baptisms were administered in the absence of the bishop."

[4] introitus vitae, III. 17. 1. In III. 3. 4 he defined the Church as "introitus vitae."

[5] *εἰς τὸ ὄνομα.*

[6] IV. 36. 4, servaret arcae typum. Massuet conjectures archetypum. Grabe sees an allusion to 1 Peter iii. 20. But this would require the addition of *per*. In 1 Pet. iii. 21, however, the antitype of Baptism is not the ark but the water through which Noah and his family were brought in safety.

[7] I. 21. 2.

on the subject are now expressed in the formularies of the Anglican Church, for he regarded it as a rite to be administered to infants who, as well as adults, are therein *reborn into God*, and as a means of grace conveying regeneration or a death unto sin and a new birth unto righteousness.

He also recommended that the rite should be administered in the regular form and with the prescribed words, condemning the practices of the Gnostics, who altered both, and turned the sacred ordinance into an elaborate ceremony. See I. 21. 3, "Some," he tells us, "prepare a marriage couch, and go through a mystical performance, pronouncing strange formulae over those who are being initiated, and declare that it is a spiritual marriage after the form of the heavenly unions. Others lead them to the water and baptize them pronouncing over them the words, 'Into the name of the unknown Father of all things, into Truth, the Mother of all things, into Him Who descended upon Jesus, into union and redemption and communion with the powers.' Others, with a view to bewilder the neophytes, repeat some Hebrew names, 'Basema Camosse,' etc., etc. Others invoke the redemption thus: 'The Name which is hidden from every deity and dominion and truth, with which Jesus of Nazareth was arrayed in the lives[1] of the light, even of Christ our Lord, Who lived through the Holy Spirit for angelic redemption.' The name that renews them is 'Messia Ufar, etc.,' which is pronounced by the consecrating minister while the consecrated one says, 'I am confirmed and redeemed, I redeem my soul from this age and from all things connected with it, in the name of Jao who redeemed his soul for redemption

[1] ζωαῖς, Lat. zonis reading ζώναις.

in the living Christ.' After this they anoint the initiated one with balsam, for they regard the ointment (*μύρον*) as a type of the sweet odour which is over the universe."

There are some, however, who assert that it is not necessary to bring people to water. They mix oil and water, and put this mixture upon the heads of those who are to receive the rites of initiation, with some of the expressions already mentioned. This they maintain is the redemption (*ἀπολύτρωσις*). They also anoint him with balsam. Others, however, object to all such ritual, asserting that the mystery of the unspeakable and invisible power should not be performed by visible and corruptible creatures. They hold that the full knowledge (*ἐπίγνωσις*) of the ineffable power in itself constitutes perfect redemption. By gnosis (knowledge) the condition which arises from ignorance is dissolved, so that gnosis is the redemption of the inner man. Others again redeem the dying[1], even to the hour of death putting oil and water on their heads or the above mentioned ointment with water and the said invocations.

Along with all these eccentricities the Gnostics carried over into their various systems the Christian doctrine of incorporation into and redemption by Christ. Some of their forms may have been founded on ancient Church practices. To the custom of sealing the forehead with chrism in confirmation, a Roman tradition[2] that gradually spread through the Western Church, there

[1] I. 21. 4, *mortuos*. Grabe remarks that Epiphanius is speaking of the dying, not of the dead. However, the dead may be meant. By the Council of Carthage (III. Can. 6) it was forbidden to give the Eucharist to the dead, so that the custom may have been in vogue. But the Gnostics could not be deterred by Church Councils or Canons. Note that it considered unlucky for Romanists to recover after Extreme Unction.

[2] Bishop Wordsworth, l.c. 156.

may be an allusion in III. 20. 2 "eum assignans Deo[1]" (sealing him for God). Compare the reference in St Patrick's letter (c. 3) to chrism, "Crismati neophyti in vesta candida dum fides fragrabat in fronte ipsorum." It is also stated that the Irish baptized the sons of the rich in milk. With regard to the account of the Gnostic ritual of Baptism and Confirmation certain parallels are to be found to the description of such in the *Ecclesiastical Hierarchy* of Dionysius the Areopagite. In both the unguent is called muron (μύρον); in the one the rite is called unguent of perfection (τελειωτικὴ χρίσις), by the others, the Gnostics, Baptism is described as leading to perfection (εἰς τελείωσιν).

The Eucharist

The Eucharist is generally placed by the early Fathers in close connection with Baptism, as continuing in man the spiritual life which was held to commence therein. See Tertullian *Adv. Marc.* IV. 34 and Hippolytus, *Can. Arab.* 38. While Baptism was generally regarded as the entrance into life, incorporation into the Body of Christ, by the forgiveness of sins and the regeneration into God[2], the Holy Spirit was believed to support the new life with Divine food in the other Sacrament. Forgiveness of sins is rarely mentioned in connection with the Eucharist, but the grace of that Sacrament, though never strictly defined, was held to

[1] Cf. Persius v. 8, Adsigna, Marce, tabellas.

[2] Harnack, *History of Dogma* II. 140, "We frequently find 'deliverance from death,' 'regeneration of man,' 'restoration to the image of God,' and 'obtaining of the Holy Spirit,' named along with the 'remission of sins,' and 'obtaining of eternal life.' Examples are to be found in Tertullian, *Adv. Marc.* I. 28 and elsewhere." Irenaeus described baptism as "the entrance to life" and also described the Church as the "entrance to life."

be a spiritual communication which imparted incorruption and a pledge of the resurrection of the body. Hooker, in language that recalls Irenaeus, describes its "effect" as "a real transmutation of our souls and bodies from sin to righteousness, from death and corruption to righteousness, immortality and life[1]."

Irenaeus, adopting the phrase of the day, styled the consecrated bread and wine the Body and Blood of Christ. In IV. 18. 4 he demands "how they (the Gnostics) can consistently regard that bread over which thanksgiving has been made as the Body of their Lord, and the cup as the cup of His Blood, if they deny that He Himself is the Son of the Creator of the world?" From one of his Fragments[2] we see that this phrase led to serious misunderstandings. "The slaves," he writes, "informed their examiners that they heard their masters speaking of the 'Holy Communion' (Θεία μετάληψις) as the Body and Blood of Christ, thinking that this was actually blood and flesh....But Blandina well answered, 'How could we endure such food, seeing that, owing to our ascetic custom, we do not partake of ordinary meat?'"

His doctrine of the Eucharist reflects everywhere the devotional spirit of the man. But we need not be surprised to find it coloured in some places by an anti-Gnostic bias. For in his controversy with Gnosticism and Manicheism he felt the necessity of emphasizing the place of the material in the Divine economy, of asserting the resurrection of the body, the salvation of the flesh, and the need of communion with Christ. For instance,

[1] *Eccl. Pol.* v. 67.

[2] Preserved in Oecumenius on 1 Pet. c. iii. p. 198. Grabe says that the passage is evidently condensed, Harvey II. 482, Frag. XIII.

in IV. 18. 5 he argues with those who deny that the Father is the Creator and that Jesus is His Word Creative, writing: "How can they say that the flesh passes into corruption and does not partake of eternal life, if that flesh has been fed on the Body and Blood of the Lord? Let them either change their doctrine or cease to make oblations. But our doctrine is in perfect harmony with the Eucharist, and the Eucharist confirms our doctrine." He then defines the Sacrament in the following words, which recall the Anglican Catechism: "We offer to God His own, and we consistently set forth the union and fellowship of flesh and spirit, and confess our belief in the resurrection of both flesh and spirit. For as the bread from the earth, receiving the invocation[1] of God, is no longer common (*κοινός*) bread, *but is a Eucharist consisting of two parts* (*ἐκ δύο πραγμάτων*), *an earthly and a heavenly*: in the same way our bodies receiving the Eucharist are no longer mortal, seeing that they possess the hope of the resurrection to eternal life." With this distinction of the earthly and the heavenly in the Eucharist compare the answers in the Church Catechism to the questions "What meanest thou by this word *Sacrament*?" and "How many parts are there in a Sacrament?" Irenaeus would doubtless have approved of the distinction made there between

[1] The Greek is *ἔκκλησιν*, evocation, not *ἐπίκλησιν*, invocation. The former word emphasizes the source of the blessing rather than its effect upon the bread and wine. Harnack, *Texte und Untersuchungen* N.F. v. 3, p. 56, argues that *ἔκκλησις* is an error of Halloix which led Pfaff to use *ἐκκαλοῦμεν* in his celebrated fragment. The Latin interpreter has "invocationem." Irenaeus himself refers to the Gnostics' use of the invocation twice in I. 13. 2, e.g. *ἐκτείνων τὸν λόγον τῆς ἐπικλήσεως*. Basil refers to this *ἐπίκλησις* in *de S. Sp.* 66. See also Liturgies of the Verona Fragment, St Mark, Armenia, Sarum, England 1549, and the Scottish Office. Cf. Mr E. Bishop's note on *ἐπίκλησις*, *Texts and Studies* VIII. 1 (1909). One would think that Irenaeus most probably wrote *ἐπίκλησιν*, but for the rule that the harder reading is the more likely.

"the outward and visible sign" and "the inward and spiritual grace." And with the pledge of resurrection conveyed in the Sacrament according to Irenaeus we may compare the solemn words of Administration: "The Body of our Lord Jesus Christ...preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life."

Justin Martyr in his *Apologia*[1] had previously written: "This food is called a Eucharist, and is only to be received by the faithful who have been baptized. For we do not receive this as *common*[2] (κοινόν) bread or *common* drink. But as through the Word of God, our Saviour Jesus Christ, after His Incarnation, took flesh and blood for our salvation, even so also the food, which has received the thanksgiving[3] of that same Word of His in prayer, and is converted by assimilation (μεταβολή) into our flesh and blood, we have been taught to regard as the flesh and blood of the Jesus who became incarnate."

That passage is to a large extent the source of Irenaeus' doctrine of the Eucharist. Irenaeus also followed his master in referring Malachi's prophecy of a pure offering to the Eucharist[4]; and, like him, regarded the offering in the Eucharist as a thank-offering of the fruits of the earth, and as a means of communion with Christ, the Lord of Creation. The Church of England in the prayer for the Church Militant prays God "to accept our alms and *oblations*" (meaning by the latter

[1] c. 65, 66.

[2] Cf. "Of this wine and bread even we are careful to let none fall to the ground." Tertullian, *De Cor. Mil.* 4.

[3] Cf. τὴν δι' εὐχῆς λόγου τοῦ παρ' αὐτοῦ εὐχαριστηθεῖσαν τροφήν, "the food which is consecrated by the prayer of His word," of Justin with "panem in quo gratiae actae sint, corpus esse Domini sui et calicem sanguinis sui," of Irenaeus IV. 18. 4.

[4] *Dialog.* c. 41. Iren. *Adv. Haer.* IV. 17. 5.

the Bread and Wine), and in the Consecration Prayer the priest says: "Grant that we receiving these Thy *creatures* of bread and wine," etc. In IV. 18. 6 Irenaeus says: "For we make our oblations to Him, not because He needs them, but in order that we may offer thanks to His dominion[1], and sanctify His Creation. For as God wants nothing of those things which belong to us, so we want to offer something to God. For God, Who needs nothing, takes up to Himself our good works with a view to reward them. Accordingly, the Word Himself gave the people the precept of making oblations, although He required them not, that they might learn to serve God. And so, likewise, He would have us offer our gift at the altar frequently and continually[2]." In the concluding words there is a reference to a continuous rather than to a daily Eucharist[3]. This latter was the use of the Church of Jerusalem[4], is stated by Jerome to have been the practice at Rome and in the Spanish Churches[5], and according to Cyprian[6] and Augustine[7] was the custom of the African Churches. There was, however, a variety of uses, and Hippolytus, according to Jerome, discussed the question "Whether the Eucharist should be received daily." This custom may possibly have been in vogue in the Church of Gaul.

This offering of bread and wine directed by prayer to the heavenly altar there becomes a Eucharist. "There is," Irenaeus writes, "an altar in heaven (for thither our prayers and oblations are directed) and a temple, as

[1] dominationi (rule), Cl. and Voss., but donationi (gift) Ar.
[2] sine intermissione.
[3] See Bishop Wordsworth, *Ministry of Grace*, 331—339.
[4] Acts ii. 46. [5] *Ep.* 71.
[6] *De Orat. Dom.* 18.
[7] *Sermon on Mount*, II. 7. 25. See also *Conf.* 6. 2. Monnica followed this use.

John said in the Apocalypse[1]." The Eucharist was evidently, then, regarded by Irenaeus as a sacrifice of the first-fruits of the earth. The question is whether he considered the Sacrament of the Eucharist not only as an occasion of communion with Christ, but also of pleading or presenting Him in sacrifice. The passage cited in support of this latter idea is IV. 18. 4: "for the Jews could not make this sacrifice, their hands being full of blood, and they did not receive the Word (through) Whom offering is made to God[2]," the words *per* and *Deo* being questioned. It is quite possible that they are sound, as in IV. 17. 6: "In God Almighty the Church makes her offering *through* (per) Jesus Christ." It is also to be remembered that Irenaeus insists on the permanence of the distinction between the two elements, the real and the heavenly, in the Lord's Supper, even after receiving the consecration of God[3]. This distinction does not favour the view that the Word is offered in the Eucharist. He never says or implies that Christ is corporally or really offered there. But he held that "by the omnipotency of Christ's Word," to use Bishop Ridley's

[1] IV. 18. 6.

[2] Verbum per quod offertur Deo. Ar. and Merc. 2 and editors have this reading. Clerm. and Voss. omit *per*. Massuet also omits it saying that this "lectio cum Irenaei scopo aptius congruit." He says that neither the Jews nor the heretics could offer a pure oblation. But this oblation he understands to be of the Verbum offered to God "in Sacrificio Eucharistiae cujus typus et umbra erant veteris legis sacrificia." "The Divine Incarnate Word is the true victim (hostia) of the new law offered by the Church" according to Massuet. But such a thought is not Irenaean. See IV. 17. 6 "In Deo Omnipotente *per Jesum Christum* offert Ecclesia"; cf. also Origen *c. Cels.* VIII. 13 "bringing to God the prayers through his Only-Begotten Son, to whom we first present them, requesting Him as an High-Priest to bring our prayers, sacrifices and intercessions to Almighty God." When speaking of these sacrifices of the Church, Irenaeus says in the same passage "conscientia ejus qui offert sanctificat sacrificium." Would he have said this if the oblation were the Son of God Himself? Would He need any sanctifying prayer or conscience of men?

[3] IV. 18. 5.

expression which is similar to "in Deo omnipotente" above, the offering is presented to God, and that the benefit thereof is "the strengthening and refreshing of our souls by the Body and Blood of Christ, as our bodies are by the Bread and Wine." In v. 2. 2 he speaks thus of the Institution: "The cup of His creation He confessed to be His own Blood by which He causes our blood to flow, and the bread of His creation He affirmed to be His own Body from which He supports our bodies." And in v. 2. 3 he says: "Seeing that the mixed chalice and the bread that is made receives the Word of God (*ἐπιδέχεται τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ*. This may mean nothing more than the word of institution; the *ἔκκλησις τοῦ θεοῦ* or *ἐπίκλησις*[1] of IV. 18. 5) and becomes the Eucharist of the Body and Blood of Christ by which the substance of our flesh is fed and fostered"..."These fruits of the earth receiving the Word of God become a Eucharist Which is the Body and Blood of Christ." The difficulty here is "the Word of God." Is it the word of institution, or the Word Himself through Whom it is offered? In the Early Church the idea prevailed that the Saviour would come at the Sunday (the day of the Resurrection) communion[2], especially the Easter one. The place of this expectation was supplied in later days by the prayer for the Lord's Advent (*ἐπιδημησάτω*) upon the Bread and Wine[3]; an idea which Bishop Wordsworth[4]

[1] Cf. v. 2. 3 *προσλαμβανόμενα τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ*. Pfaff's 2nd fragm. has an *evocation* of the Holy Spirit, i.e. *ἐκκαλοῦμεν τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον*.

[2] This expectation would explain St Paul's words "Ye do proclaim the Lord's death till he come" (1 Cor. xi. 26). The Jews expected that their Messiah would come in the middle of the night after the feast (*Jerome* on Mt. iv. 25). Buxtorf *Syn. Iud.* p. 416 *Maran-athá* "the Lord cometh" (1 Cor. xvi. 22, *Didaché* x. 4) is the watchword of the Eucharist. Cf. use of Hosanna (*Apost. Const.* VIII. 12, p. 259 Lagarde).

[3] Sarapion's Prayer Book.

[4] *Ministry of Grace*, p. 314.

suggests may have been taken from the words of Irenaeus quoted above[1]. While then it is not clear that it is Christ the Word to Whom reference is intended, it is not impossible that Irenaeus held, as Keble afterwards did, that Christ is the real consecrator in every Eucharist. On the other hand, it was the popular conception of his day that the word or prayer spoken over a thing imparted some mysterious virtue to it. See the account of the Gnostic invocation in I. 13. 2[2] already referred to.

With regard to the *virtus sacramenti*, he taught that the soul is brought into touch with the Word in the Eucharist, and has communion with Him Who is really present in the Sacrament. "For we need communion with Him, and therefore He gave Himself freely[3]." He seems to lend support to Waterland's view that the *res sacramenti* is the crucified rather than the glorified Body of Christ. His controversy with Gnosticism led him to lay stress upon the reality of our Lord's natural manhood, and to regard the cleansing and nourishing of our bodies and the gift of immortality to the perishing flesh as the grace of the Eucharist. His emphatic assertion that "the Eucharist consists of two realities (ἐκ δύο πραγμάτων), a heavenly and an earthly," shows that he was not aware of any such change as is implied by the term transubstantiation. This statement of Irenaeus would, indeed, as Bishop Gore points out[4], safeguard the Church against that doctrine of transubstantiation, which

[1] V. 2. 3.

[2] The Gnostic Marcus in the Eucharist in I. 13. 2 (passage recovered from Epiphanius) prolonging the word of invocation ἐπὶ πλέον ἐκτείνων τὸν λόγον τῆς ἐπικλήσεως makes the water appear red so that it seemed that the Grace who is over all dropped her blood into the cup at his invocation διὰ τῆς ἐπικλήσεως αὐτοῦ, cf. Deus cujus et invocationem tremebant (i.e. daemones) II. 6. 2. Hippolytus *Philos.* VI. 39 refers to this "word of invocation."

[3] V. 2. 1.

[4] *Body of Christ*, p. 116.

he says "owed its origin to the monophysite tendency of the Eastern Church, the tendency to absorb and annihilate the human in the divine, the natural in the supernatural" and which Bishop Wordsworth describes as "easily expressed but untenable, and as having changed the solemn Eucharist from a home-like communion feast into a drama in which the priest and his assistants are the only participators[1]." There is, consequently, "a line of deep cleavage" between the views of Irenaeus and those of the Roman Church on this subject. But it is no longer certain that he ever referred to the Bread and Wine as "antitypes," the genuineness of the Pfaff Fragment, in which that expression is found, having been disproved by Dr Harnack[2]. Tertullian, however, declares that Jesus used bread "to represent His own Body[3]," and speaks of the bread as "figura corporis." This expression also occurs in the Latin Canon in the *De Sacramentis*, a work founded on Ambrose's *De Mysteriis*: "Fac nobis hanc oblationem adscriptam...quod figura est corporis et sanguinis Domini nostri Jesu Christi." Irenaeus did not speak of any physical change in the elements, or conceive Christ as present in a corporeal manner in the Eucharist; but it seems as if he alludes to some mystical or sacramental addition of the Word or of a consecrating word to the elements, that entitled the latter to be called the

[1] l.c. p. 103.

[2] οἱ μεταλαβόντες τούτων τῶν ἀντιτύπων Pfaff, Fragm. 2. Harnack, *Texte und Unter.* N.F. v. 3, p. 36.

[3] *Adv. Marc.* I. 14, nec panem (reprobavit) qui ipsum corpus suum repraesentat, etiam in sacramentis propriis egens mendicitatibus Creatoris, "the bread with which he *represents* His own very body, even in His Sacraments requiring 'the beggarly elements' of the Creator." Cf. *Apost. Const.* VIII. 12, "We beseech thee to send thy Holy Spirit upon this sacrifice that he may declare this bread to be the body of Christ" (ὅπως ἀποφήνῃ). This is borrowed by Pfaff for his Second Fragment.

Eucharist of the Body and Blood of Christ. Such a sacramental union of the Word with the consecrated elements would be based by him on the fact that the Word was the Creator of the world. Whereas we regard the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper as an extension of the grace of the Incarnation; in his anti-Gnostic eyes it was rather an extension of His creative energy, by virtue of which "He acknowledged the wine-cup of His creation to be His Blood, and the bread of His creation to be His Body[1]." And as such it served as a protest against that shallow Manichaeism or Spiritualism that considered all that is material or bodily as having no function or place in the realm of grace. The body, Irenaeus insists, as well as the soul is sanctified by the Eucharist to everlasting life.

With regard to the order of the Eucharist, there are in the Treatise four clearly marked steps in the service before the act of communion: (1) the presentation of the offerings with prayers, (2) the thanksgiving, (3) the evocation or invocation of the Word (?), and (4) the sanctification of the elements.

Presentation. In IV. 18. 5 he writes "we offer to God the things that are His own, suitably proclaiming the communion and union of flesh and spirit." In IV. 18. 6 he says: "We present our offering, offering thanks over His gift[2]"; and when speaking of the heavenly altar, he says in the same section, "thither our prayers and oblations are directed." And in IV. 17. 5 he treats part,

[1] V. 2. 2. The Word of God might well call these fruits of the earth His Body and His Blood for He was their creator, and it was only through His Divine energy that they could pass into our substance and be assimilated by us.

[2] *gratias agentes donationi ejus* (donationi Ar. etc. dominationi Cler. Vet. Voss).

if not the whole, of the service as an offering of the first-fruits, writing: "Our Lord when advising His disciples to offer to God the first-fruits of His creatures." The corresponding passage, "to accept our alms and oblations," in the Prayer for the Church Militant has been noticed. Again, he says in IV. 17. 5 "And similarly the cup, which is of the same creation as ourselves, He confessed was His Blood, and taught that it was the *new oblation* of the New Testament, which the Church receiving from the Apostles, *offers* to God in all the world, even to Him Who gives us nourishment, the first-fruits of His gifts in the New Testament."

Thanksgiving. In IV. 18. 4 he demands how the Gnostics, who deny that Christ was the creator of the bread and wine, consistently say that the bread over which[1] thanksgiving has been made[2] is the Body of their Lord. He also says in the same section: "It is our bounden duty to make an oblation to God, and in all cases to be found grateful to God our Maker, with pure mind, with faith unfeigned, with firm hope and fervent love, offering the first-fruits of His own creatures[3] to Him. And this oblation the Church alone can—for the Jews cannot do so—offer in purity to the Maker. presenting to Him an oblation of His creatures with thanksgiving (*cum gratiarum actione*)." *Eucharistein* (εὐχαριστεῖν) is used in the sense of *consecrate* in I. 13. 2, e.g., to consecrate (εὐχαριστεῖν) mixed cups of wine. The Latin renders it by *gratias agere*, to give thanks, erroneously. Compare his letter to Victor, "Anicetus

[1] Cf. Justin Martyr, *Apologia* 65: "And when the President has concluded the prayers and the thanksgiving (or the Eucharist), the people say 'Amen.'" Cf. 1 Cor. xiv. 16.

[2] in quo gratiae actae sint.

[3] Cf. P. B. Consecration Prayer. "Grant that we receiving these thy *creatures* of bread and wine."

conceded the Eucharist (i.e., the consecration) to Polycarp[1]."

Evocation or Invocation. "For the bread after receiving the evocation of God is no longer ordinary bread, but a Eucharist consisting of two realities, an earthly and a heavenly[2]." This is described in V. 2. 3 as the bread receiving the Word (or word) of God, and has already been discussed at length. We learn incidentally from the same passage that a mixed cup was used. So Cyprian, Ep. 63, *Const. Ap.* 8. 12, Council of Carthage, Saxon Church and Syrian Church.

Sanctification. The result of this Evocation or Invocation is a sanctification of the natural elements. In IV. 18. 6 we have the phrase, "We present our offering, thanking Him for His gift, and *sanctifying His creature*[3]." Compare the prayer of the English Prayer-Book of 1549: "And with Thy Holy Spirit and Word vouchsafe to bless and *sanctify* these Thy gifts and creatures of bread and wine." See also the Scottish Office. The word "sanctification" may correspond to "consecration" in our Office.

One aspect of the Eucharist, eloquently expressed in the Anglican Liturgy as the offering and presentation of "ourselves, our souls and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy and lively sacrifice" unto God, and founded on Romans xii. 1, was not overlooked by Irenaeus, although he regarded the offering of the first-fruits of the earth, the Christian *minkhah*[4], as the chief oblation of the Church[5], for he writes in IV. 19. 3: Sacrifices do not sanctify the

[1] Eusebius *H.E.* V. 24 παρεχώρησεν τὴν εὐχαριστίαν.
[2] IV. 18. 5. [3] sanctificantes creaturam.
[4] (מִנְחָה) in the Mosaic law always of an unbloody sacrifice such as the meat (bread) and drink offerings. Lev. ii. 1, etc.
[5] IV. 18. 4.

man, but the pure conscience of the man sanctifies the sacrifice." And with his words that describe the frame of mind in which the Church presents her offering, i.e., "with grateful hearts, in a pure mind, with faith unfeigned, firm hope and steadfast love[1]," compare our words of Administration, "and feed on Him in thy heart by faith with thanksgiving."

The Pfaff Fragments.

These fragments have been cited in connection with Irenaeus' views of the Eucharist. The four fragments are published in Stieren's and Harvey's editions. Prof. Harnack in *Texte und Untersuchungen*[2] gives an interesting account of these fragments, which he stigmatizes as deliberate forgeries. They were first published in an Italian journal (1713), *Giornale de' Letterati d'Italia*, accompanied by an editorial note by Scipio Maffei pointing out that the full title of the author, Irenaeus, Bishop of Lugdunum, was omitted, that the elements of the Lord's Supper were designated "antitypes," that the Spirit was invoked, and the doubtful Apostolical Constitutions were used, all which points were against the authenticity of the fragments. Pfaff replied in 1715 very feebly to the charges, said he found them in manuscripts of some antiquity and was attracted by the light they threw upon the oblation and consecration of the Eucharist.

The following is the passage on which so much was staked: "Now these oblations are not according to the law, the handwriting of which the Lord removed and

[1] IV. 18. 4, in sententia pura, et fide sine hypocrisi, in spe firma, in dilectione ferventi.

[2] N.F. v. 3.

cancelled, but they are according to the Spirit, for we must worship God in Spirit and in truth. Wherefore, the oblation of the Eucharist is not a carnal one, but a spiritual, and in this regard is pure. For we make an oblation to God of the Bread and the Cup of Blessing, making our thanksgiving to God because He commanded the earth to bring forth these fruits for our sustenance. And then, when we have finished the oblation, we *evoke* (ἐκκαλοῦμεν) *the Holy Spirit* that He may exhibit (ἀποφήνῃ) this Sacrifice, the Bread as the Body of Christ, and the Cup as the Blood of Christ, in order that they who receive these *antitypes* (ἀντίτυπα) may obtain remission of sins and eternal life."

An examination of this and the other passages revealed (1) a use of the 8th Book of the *Apostolic Constitutions*, (2) an expression, "we evoke the Holy Spirit," which is based on the use of ἔκκλησις in the Treatise, (3) a connection of the Eucharist with forgiveness, whereas Irenaeus associates it with the hope of resurrection. It seems that the irony of fate has not allowed the writings of Irenaeus to be safeguarded against that form of literary composition he most abhorred—the cento[1].

[1] See II. 14. 1 centonem ex multis et pessimis panniculis consarcientes.

CHAPTER XVI

PSYCHOLOGY, SALVATION, FUTURE HOPE

THE Psychology of Irenaeus is somewhat obscured by his theological views, and somewhat complicated because he speaks of man in some places as consisting of body and soul, and at other times recognizes the Pauline division of body, soul, and spirit. The chief difficulty in discussing his psychology, however, arises from the fact that he seems at times to identify the spirit of man with the Spirit of God, and to define the likeness of God, after which man is intended to develop, as situated now in reason, now in freedom of will, and anon in communion with the Divine Spirit. Broadly speaking, we may say that he recognized a trinity of body, soul and spirit in one personality, and the freedom of will, the possession of the image of God and the capacity to grow after His likeness in man, who was naturally imperfect because a creature[1], who lost his immortality because of his disobedience[2], and who attained incorruptibility through the Incarnation of his Lord[3].

The tripartite division of man is set forth in V. 9. 1 :

[1] IV. 38. 1, *καθὸ δὲ μή ἐστιν ἀγέννητα κατὰ τοῦτο καὶ ὑστεροῦνται τοῦ τελείου.*

[2] IV. 39. 2, quomodo perfectus nuper effectus? quomodo immortalis, qui in natura mortali non obedivit? qui fuit inobediens Deo et projectus de immortalitate, III. 20. 2.

[3] munus incorruptelae consecutus est...per Filium Dei eam quae est per ipsum percipiens adoptionem, III. 20. 2.

"The perfect man consists of flesh, soul and spirit; one of these saving and fashioning[1], that is, the spirit; the other being united and formed, that is, the flesh; while that which lies between the two is the soul, which sometimes follows the spirit and is raised by it, but at other times sympathizes with the flesh and is drawn by it into earthly passions." In the conclusion of this passage he, however, distinctly refers to the Spirit of God as that which saves and forms into life. In II. 33. 5, he speaks of a human spirit, saying: "All who are enrolled for life shall rise again having their own bodies, their own souls and their own spirits." But he continues, lapsing into dichotomy, "they who deserve punishment shall depart into it, having their own souls and bodies." In V. 6. 1, he speaks of the threefold division of human nature—body, soul and spirit. No one of these by itself constitutes man. "But the blending and union of all three constitute a perfect man[2]." Does he mean that the bad have only body and soul, and not spirit? He quotes 1 Thess. v. 23, explaining that the *perfect* are those who present the three blameless to God; and proceeds to say that "they are perfect who have the *Spirit of God* abiding in them and have preserved their souls and bodies blameless," as if the Spirit of God were something bestowed upon the good only and became a part of their nature, even their spirit. The dual basis is asserted plainly in the Preface to the fourth book (*c.* 3): "Man is an

[1] At first sight it would seem that Irenaeus was expressing the theory that "the soul is form and doth the body make," that the soul or spirit is the living substance which has woven its own body as the spider his web, in opposition to the theory that the soul is the product of the forces of the material world, as heat issues from burning coals. But he proceeds "perfecti qui et *Spiritum* in se perseverantem habuerint *Dei* et *animas* et *corpora* sine querela servaverint."

[2] Commixtio autem et unctio horum omnium perfectum hominem efficit (v. 6. 1).

organism consisting of soul and flesh, which was formed after the likeness of God and was fashioned by His Hands; that is by the Son and the Holy Spirit[1]."

In II. 33. 1 et sq., he discusses the relation of the soul to the body, and emphasizes the supremacy of the soul, which he states is so far independent of the body that whatever it discerns by itself in dreams, by reflection or mental thought, though the body be quiescent, it can remember and report. "The soul teaches the body and imparts to it its spiritual vision." (Anima docet corpus et participat de spiritali ei facta visione[2].) The soul is stronger than the body, ruling and regulating it (possidet et principatur corpori). The body is like an instrument, but the soul is like an artist. The slowness of the body retards the swiftness of the thought, just as the dull weight of the instrument delays the velocity of artistic intuition and gives rise to an *adagio* movement[3]. The soul never existed in other bodies, otherwise it would have knowledge of them. But as each of us receives his body through the operation of God, so he acquires his soul. "For God is not so poor in resources but that He can confer its own soul on each individual body, just as He confers its own form[4]." The argument from memory is not, however, conclusive, as the somnambulist, though seemingly fully conscious and able to plan, during his walk, forgets all about it afterwards.

The Divine spirit is confused or identified with the

[1] homo temperatio animae et carnis.

[2] II. 33. 4. Cf. IV. 13. 2, "the soul cleanses the body," per ipsam corpus voluntarie emundari docuit.

[3] corpus enim organo simile est; anima autem artificis rationem obtinet. quemadmodum itaque artifex velociter quidem operationem secundum se adinvenit, in organo autem tardius illam perficit, propter rei subjectae immobilitatem, et illius mentis velocitas admixta tarditati organi temperatam perficit operationem.

[4] II. 33. 5, χαρακτῆρα.

human in v. 9. 2: "Our Lord testified to the weakness of the flesh and the readiness of the spirit. If one then shall add the readiness of the Spirit, as it were, as a stimulus to the infirmity of the flesh, the inevitable result is that the strong controls the weak and the infirmity of the flesh is absorbed by the strength of the Spirit, and he who is such is no longer carnal but spiritual on account of the fellowship of the Spirit. The Spirit absorbing its infirmity takes the flesh unto itself, and a living man is made of both; living because of his share of the Spirit, man because of the substance of the flesh. The flesh when without the Spirit of God is dead, being without life. But where the Spirit of the Father is, there is a living man....The flesh possessed by the Spirit is, indeed, forgetful of itself, but assuming the character (qualitatem) of the Spirit is made conformable to the Word of God." If you remove the substance of the flesh, and consider the spirit only by itself, you have no longer a spiritual man but the spirit of a man or the Spirit of God. See also v. 6. 1: "But when this spirit blended with the soul is united to the workmanship of God (the body), the man is rendered perfect and spiritual by reason of the outpouring of the Spirit, and such is he who was made in the image and likeness of God." In his explanation of the text (1 Cor. 15. 50) 'flesh and blood cannot inherit (*κληρονομῆσαι*) the kingdom of God,' he points out that it is through the Spirit of God possessing and inheriting them, that our mortal limbs are translated into the kingdom of heaven[1]. It was with the object of preventing us from losing the Spirit, Who possesses us, and so losing our life that the

[1] *ταῦτα δὲ κληρονομεῖται ὑπὸ τοῦ Πνεύματος, μεταφερόμενα εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν*, v. 9. 4.

Apostle exhorts us to have fellowship with the Spirit, saying with reason, 'flesh and blood cannot possess the kingdom of God,' as who should say, 'Do not err, for unless the Word of God dwelleth in you and the Spirit of the Father be in you, you shall have lived vainly and to no purpose, forasmuch as being this only, i.e. flesh and blood, you will not be able to possess the Kingdom of God'."

In V. 12. 2 he distinguishes between the *breath* of natural life (*πνοή*) and the breath of spiritual life (*πνεῦμα*), according to Is. xlii. 5[1], the former being given to all people, while the Spirit only belongs to those who tread down earthly passions. "For it was necessary," he says, "that a human being should be fashioned first, and then that it should receive the soul, and afterwards the communion of the Spirit." In V. 1. 1, he writes: "The Lord redeemed us with His own blood, giving His *soul* for our *souls*, and His flesh for our flesh, and poured out the Spirit of the Father upon the union and communion of God and man."

With regard to the image and likeness of God, he says: "If the Spirit should be wanting to the soul, he who is such is, indeed, psychical or soul-possessing (animalis), but is carnal, abandoned, and imperfect, having the image of God in his formation (plasma), but not yet receiving the

[1] Irenaeus follows the LXX. of Is. xlii. 5 and lvii. 16. The former runs in Hebrew, "Who giveth breath נְשָׁמָה (LXX. *πνοήν*) and spirit רוּחַ *πνεῦμα* (flatum, spiritum Vg.)"; the latter "for the spirit (רוּחַ) should fail before me, and the souls (נְשָׁמוֹת) which I have made." The Hebrew עָטַף means to faint, languish. Fuerst renders "the spirit is weak before me" (LXX. *ἐξελεύσεται*, wrongly). The reference in preceding verse being to the "spirit of the humble," the spirit in lvii. 16 cannot refer to the Spirit of God, as Irenaeus understands it, "rightly referring the Spirit to God Who poured it forth, through the adoption of sons, upon the human race" (V. 12. 2).

likeness which is given by the Spirit[1]." The "image" here seems to be the original endowment of human nature, and the "likeness" its future state. The Word of God at His Incarnation restored both to man, "for He showed the 'image,' truly, having become that which was His own image Himself, and He established firmly the 'similitude' by making man like to the invisible Father through the visible Word[2]." This restoration is a very gradual process, but it is constant, for the Word "forms and prepares us for life, and is present with His handiwork and perfects it after the image and likeness of God[3]." It is a remote ideal never to be realized until "the creature embraces the Word and ascends to Him, and rising above the angels, shall be made after the image and likeness of God"—the concluding words of the Treatise. In v. 8. 1, he writes: "It is the universal grace of the Spirit that accomplishes the purpose of the Father, for it shall make man after the image and likeness of God."

Obedience on man's part is required, "for subjection to God means immortality, and the continuance of immortality is the glory of the Uncreated[4]." "By this orderly arrangement man, created in the image, develops in the likeness of the Uncreated God.....the Father planning and commanding, the Son working and administering, the Spirit nourishing and increasing, while the man makes slow but gradual progress, ever ascending to the Perfect, that is, drawing near to the Uncreated One." "But since man from the beginning is endowed

[1] v. 6. 1. According to the Schoolmen the "image" of God implies the higher mental faculties, the "similitude" the possession of the Spirit. See *Adv. Haer.* v. 1. 3.

[2] v. 16. 2. [3] v. 16. 1.

[4] iv. 38. 3. Greek δόξα ἀγέννητος mistake for ἀγεννήτου, Lat. infecti.

with a free will, and God in Whose similitude he was made has a free will, the advice is always given to the man to hold fast the good which is perfected by obedience to God[1]." Accordingly the sentence "Let us make man in our image and after our likeness" suggested to Irenaeus, as it afterwards did to Bishop Westcott, the promise and prophecy of the Incarnation, the coming of One Who should manifest both in a human life, restoring to man the possession of the one and the power of realizing the other. Origen[2] says: "'In the image of God made He him' means that man received the dignity of that image at the first creation, while the perfection of the likeness is kept for the consummation: that means that he should himself gain it by his own endeavour, since the possibility of perfection had been given to him at the first."

Irenaeus gives, however, various answers to the question, "Wherein consists this likeness of God?" In V. 6. 1, it seems to consist in the possession of the Spirit (similitudinem assumens per Spiritum); in V. 1. 3, in the receptivity of the Perfect Father[3]. "Man was made in the beginning a rational creature by the breath of God; but in the end he was made a living and perfect man, able to embrace the perfect Father, by the Word of the Father and the Spirit of God united to the ancient substance of Adam's creation, that as in the psychical we all die, even so in the spiritual we may all be made alive. According to the Father's will His Hands made man living and perfect so that he should be a man (lit. Adam) after the image and similitude of God." But in IV. 37. 4, the likeness consists in the freedom of the will.

[1] IV. 37. 4. [2] *De Princip.* III. 6. 1.
[3] perfectum effecit hominem, capientem perfectum Patrem.

"Since man had a free will from the beginning, and God, in Whose likeness he was made, has a free will, this advice is given to him." In IV. 37. 1, he says the good are praised, because they performed the good when they had the power to refuse to do so, and vice versa, treating freedom of choice as the basis of human responsibility and the underlying principle of merit and demerit. We all are responsible for our conduct. "For we all have the same nature, being able to retain and perform the good, and lose or avoid it. Some are justly praised among sensible men and much more by God, for their choice of what is universally good and for their perseverance, and others are blamed for the contrary. The prophets exhorted us to do what was right and just, because this lies in our power, and we need good counsel 'lest we forget[1].'" We cannot compel men to be good, but we may advise them. "There is no violence with God, but wisdom ever reigns with Him, therefore He gives good counsel to all[2]." "If any be unworthy to follow the Gospel, it lies in his power, but it is not expedient, to disobey. The advice is always given him to hold fast that which is good...Even in the exercise of his faith as well as in his conduct God has allowed man to be perfectly free[3]." Origen, like Irenaeus, also, as we have seen, insisted on freedom of will as the endowment of rational creatures, and though far from supporting the self-sufficiency afterwards known as Pelagianism, they both regarded the freedom of man as expressed in the image of God[4].

[1] IV. 37. 2.

[2] IV. 37. 1, βία θεῷ οὐ πρόσεστιν· ἀγαθὴ δὲ γνώμη πάντοτε συμπάρεστιν αὐτῷ.

[3] IV. 37. 4, non tantum in operibus, sed etiam in fide, liberum et suae potestatis arbitrium hominis servavit Deus.

[4] Of the soul Origen writes, "It draws and takes to itself the Word of

Freedom of will is a test of character. "For we have received freedom of will, in which condition a man's reverence, fear and love of God are more severely tested[1]." It brings additional responsibility. "For man, being endowed with reason and in this respect being like to God, is a perfectly free agent, with the power of self-determination, and is, therefore, responsible for the fact that he sometimes becomes wheat and sometimes chaff[2]." This freedom of will gives an ethical character to the Divine punishment, "for God always maintained both the freedom and self-government of man and His own precept, so that they who disobey may be justly judged for their disobedience, and that they who have obeyed Him and believed in Him may be rewarded with eternal life[3]." Each person has a free choice and unfettered judgement, while God exercises providence over all. Communion with God is the result of good moral choice; separation from Him of the opposite[4]. The possession of freedom of moral choice divides man from the creation, for "all such things were made for the sake of the man who is being saved (homine qui salvatur)[5],

God in proportion to its capacity and faith; and when souls have drawn to themselves the Word of God, and have let Him penetrate their senses and their understandings, and have perceived the sweetness of His fragrance... filled with vigour and cheerfulness they hasten after Him" (*in Cant.* I.). Tertullian also considered the image and likeness of God to consist in freedom of will, "oportebat imaginem et similitudinem Dei, liberi arbitrii et suae potestatis institui, in qua hoc ipsum imago et similitudo Dei deputaretur, arbitrii scilicet libertas et potestas," *c. Marc.* II. 6.

[1] IV. 16. 5, libertatis potestatem acceperimus: in qua magis probatur homo si revereatur et timeat et diligat Dominum.

[2] IV. 4. 3.

[3] IV. 15. 2.

[4] V. 27. 1, ὅσοι ἀφίσταντα ι κατὰ τὴν γνώμην αὐτῶν τοῦ θεοῦ τούτοις τὸν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ χωρισμὸν ἐπάγει...separavit semetipsum a Deo voluntaria sententia.

[5] V. 29. 1, illud quod est sui arbitrii et suae potestatis maturans ad immortalitatem, et aptabiliorem eum ad aeternam subjectionem Deo praeparans (sc. Deus).

God maturing for immortality that which is possessed of its own free will and power of self-determination, and preparing him (i.e. man) for the eternal obedience to God." This free will is given to him that he may choose the better course[1].

That possession is not only a responsibility, it is a stimulus to work, wherever it is recognized, just as its neglect fosters pessimism. "Therefore the Lord said, 'The kingdom of heaven belongs to the violent,' that is, they who use strenuous endeavour and earnest vigilance take it by force. So St Paul said to the Corinthians, 'So run that ye may obtain.' That excellent wrestler exhorted us to struggle for immortality, that we may win the crown which is attained by labour and does not grow of its own accord. The greater the struggle that wins it the more valuable it seems. For that which comes spontaneously is less beloved[2] than that which is attained by a great effort. Since it was to our advantage[3] to love God more, both the Lord and the Apostle taught us to find this out with strenuous endeavour for ourselves. Otherwise this good gift (of free will) would surely be irrational[4] because it would be undisciplined[5]." "For what enjoyment of the good can they have who ignore it? What glory can they have who never sought it?

[1] IV. 39. 1, "ut electionem meliorum faciat." Cf. Ovid, *M.* 7. 21,

video meliora proboque,
deteriora sequor.

[2] οὐχ ὁμοίως ἀγαπᾶται τὰ ἐκ τοῦ αὐτομάτου προσγινόμενα τοῖς μετὰ σπουδῆς εὑρισκομένοις (IV. 37. 7).

[3] *pro nobis* cannot mean *penes nos* as Massuet. Grabe rightly interprets *e re nostra*.

[4] insensatum bonum. Insensatus has a twofold sense in the Latin Irenaeus. In I. 20. 1 and II. 30. 1 it means foolish, ἀνόητος. But in II. 14. 6 and II. 30. 4 it is contrasted with sensibilia, e.g. sensibilia et insensata, i.e. αἰσθητὰ καὶ νοητά, as things for the intellect, intellectual matters.

[5] IV. 37. 7.

And what crown can they possess who have not won it as victors in the struggle[1]?"

The heresy known as Antinomianism has little support in these vigorous sentences. In IV. 37. 5, he maintains the advantages of free will against those who advocate a mechanical view of human nature and regard the autonomy of man as derogatory to the omnipotence of God. Such, he says, do themselves treat the Lord as if He were not all powerful, as if, forsooth, He were unable to accomplish what He willed, or as if, on the other hand, He were ignorant that those who are material[2] by nature, to use their own jargon, are unable to receive His incorruptibility. But He should not have created angels, they say, capable of transgression or men capable of ingratitude. "Suppose this objection held good," Irenaeus argues, "virtue would lose its sweetness, communion with God its value, and men would never seek to attain to what is good when it would come without any effort or study on their part, but of its own accord and without their concern. And so goodness would be lightly prized, because men would be good by nature rather than from moral choice, goodness being a matter of impulse, not of deliberate choice, and therefore they would not understand this very thing that virtue is beautiful in itself, and would consequently fail to enjoy it."

[1] IV. 37. 6.

[2] choicus, material. *χοϊκός* and *ὑλικός* are used without distinction, cf. I. 6. 1 and I. 6. 2. According to the Gnostics matter could not be saved, and therefore, they said, our Lord took nothing material upon Him. The psychical, however, being *αὐτεξούσιος*, endowed with freedom of will, may be saved, and therefore the Saviour took the psychical Christ from the Demiurge, but from the economy was clothed upon with a body of psychical essence only. Again they argued that as the material cannot share in salvation (*τὸ χοϊκὸν ἀδύνατον σωτηρίας μετασχεῖν*), so the spiritual cannot see corruption, no matter what doings it may be connected with (I. 6. 2).

Irenaeus appears to have been as well acquainted with the psychology of the mind as he was with that of the will. In the first place he lays down the fundamental psychological distinction between God and man. Whereas the mental process in man, who is a composite creature, passes through many stages from perception to thought, from thought to reflection, and from reflection to reason[1]; with God, Who is untouched by passion, and is simple Being, the process is simple and uniform. For He is all mind, and all Spirit, all perception, all thought, all reason, all hearing, all eye, all light, and all source of every good[2]. Whereas in man the Logos proceeds from the Nous, "there is nothing before or after, nor any other distinction, with God, but He is all Nous, all Logos, all equal, similar, uniform, constant[3]." For God is all Mind and all Logos, what He thinks, that He speaks, what He speaks, that He thinks. For His thought is Logos, and Logos is mind, and the Father Himself is all-embracing mind[4].

He gives an interesting analysis of the hidden processes of the Nous or understanding which reminds one of Kant's transcendental Analytik. Perception, thought, intellectual perception, deliberation, examination of thought—all originate from the same understanding[5],

[1] II. 28. 4.

[2] II. 13. 3 (cf. I. 12. 2), et simplex, et non compositus et similimembrius (ὁμοιομερής), totus sensus, totus spiritus, totus sensualitas, totus ennoea, totus ratio. Cf. II. 28. 4.

[3] II. 13. 8, reading *alterius* in place of *anterius*.

[4] II. 28. 5.

[5] II. 13. 2. The first exercise of its powers with regard to anything is called ennoia (perception): when this gains strength and time and embraces the whole soul, it becomes enthymesis (consideration). Consideration when it lingers over the same subject and is, as it were, approved, becomes intelligent perception (sensatio). This when it has been developed is termed deliberation (consilium); and the continued exercise of deliberation becomes the examination of thought (or judgement).

but represent different stages of development. The underlying synthetic unity of knowledge is the Nous or understanding. "It controls these various processes, though itself invisible, it sends forth speech by means of the aforesaid processes, as the sun emits light by its rays, but is itself sent forth of none[1]." "The intellect of man, his thought and intention and other such things, are nothing but the soul (*anima*), and the operations and motions of the soul have no substance apart from the soul[2]." He does not make the ordinary mistake of confusing the mind with its functions or the personality with its phases, while recognizing that they cannot exist apart from it. Regarding knowledge in the sense of a full discernment of the whole series of causes, he refers

[1] II. 13. 2. Cf. the use of "the standing and abiding ego," the "original synthetic unity of apperception" or "transcendental unity of apperception" in Kant. As distinguished from the fragmentary or empirical consciousness which accompanies the various representations, there is a consciousness of which one becomes aware when one combines these various representations, and is conscious of the synthesis. When I say that they all belong to me, I mean that I am able to combine them by this mental synthesis into one whole—the synthetical unity of apperception. As distinguished from intuition which gives multiplicity, self-consciousness gives us unity: objects of the understanding are formed of groups of intuitions and presuppose an underlying unity of consciousness that unites and groups the material presented by the senses, the intuitions. See Kant's *Kritik*, Mahaffy and Bernard, p. 128 et sq.

[2] II. 29. 3. Cf. Aristotle, *De Anima* 411 a 16, "Knowledge is an attribute of the soul, so also are perception, opinion, desire, wish and appetency generally." In the next paragraph he insisted upon the unity of the soul. In 429 a 10, he says "it is by intellect (*νοῦς*) that the soul thinks and conceives, knows and understands," treating the *νοῦς* as a "part" of the soul in the popular language of his day, for all mention of "parts" of the soul must be provisional according to 432 a 22 et sq. Substitute the word "man" for "soul" in the first passage in Aristotle, according to the precept 408 b 13, "it would be better not to say that the soul learns, but that the man does so with his soul," and in the passage in Irenaeus, and both are brought into line with the best modern psychological school according to which "the proper *subject*, that which acts or is acted on, is not the faculty or the organ but the Unitary Ego. The Ego *knows*; the Ego wills; the Ego feels; three functions, of which the last alone is passive" (Martineau, *Types of Ethical Theory*, II. 13). This is an improvement upon the departmental conception of human nature.

to the necessary limitations of the human reason and speculation which cause the reason to fall into antinomies and self-contradictions when it attempts to grasp the unseen, unrevealed and unconditioned. "Seeing that we know but in part, we should leave these general questions to Him Who gives us grace in part" (III. 28. 7).

We might consider Irenaeus an idealist in the modern sense, for he recognized a supernatural element in will, which is treated in the last instance as a Divine gift, and also in knowledge. For the Nous, which may be regarded as the thinking Ego in this treatise, "is the source and origin, the fountain-head of all knowledge[1]."

By this sound psychology he points us to the Word of God as the solution of all questions connected with the "pure reason" of Christianity. As Whichcote said, "Reason is the candle of the Lord, lighted by God, and lighting us to God," *res illuminata illuminans.*

When dwelling on the Personality of God he did not conceive that he was limiting the Divine Life and Existence. The contrast between the *ego* and the *non-ego* in the case of man suggests limitation, but need not imply it in the case of Deity. The *non-ego* in the case of man not only defines the circumference but stimulates the activity of the *ego.* And, as Lotze points out[2], a human person, as "he gradually incorporates the results of external stimuli in his memory and character, becomes in a measure self-sufficing, and can produce much both of thought and action without recourse to the external world." Thus what is "only approximately possible for

[1] II. 13. 1, nus enim est ipsum quod est principale, et summum, et velut principium et fons universi sensus.

[2] *Microcosmus*, IX. c. 4. See Illingworth's *Personality Human and Divine*, note 12.

the finite mind, the conditioning of its life by itself, takes place without limit in God, and no contrast of an external world is necessary for Him." God can, therefore, be conceived as personal without any reference to aught beyond Himself. Indeed, in Him alone perfect personality is found. So Irenaeus held. In his system God is self-sufficing, omniscient, omnipotent, containing all things and of none contained[1], and yet His is a distinct, definite, self-conscious existence. In relation to the Son the immeasurable Father is measured, "for the Son is the measure of the Father since He contains Him[2]." An expression which, as Harnack observes, "is by no means intended to denote a diminution, but rather to signify the identity of Father and Son." Origen[3] declares "we must say that the power of God is limited, for if the Divine power be unlimited, it cannot perceive itself." The self-determination and self-consciousness involved in the relation of the Father and Son make that Divine Nature intelligible to us. On the one hand, we are taught to realize the Divine likeness in man, and, on the other, we have the human ideal of an existence self-conscious and self-controlled in God. The conception of the Triune Personality, although inadequate, is not an unthinkable and unthinking abstraction, whereas the undifferentiated unity of the Unitarian is unintelligible to us for whom only a self-conscious, self-distinguishing intelligence is intelligent.

[1] IV. 11. 2, Deus perfectus in omnibus, *ipse sibi aequalis et similis* (imply self-consciousness), totus cum sit lumen et totus mens, et totus substantia et fons omnium bonorum...semper idem est.

[2] IV. 4. 2, bene, qui dixit ipsum immensum Patrem in Filio mensuratum: *mensura enim Patris Filius, quoniam et capit eum.* See Harnack, *History of Dogma*, II. 264. The Divine self-sufficiency is often expressed, e.g. ipse nullius indigens, IV. 14. 2.

[3] *De Princ.* II. 9.

Salvation

Irenaeus contributes many profound thoughts on the salvation and future hope of man. In III. 23. 1, he declares that the whole economy of man's salvation had its origin in the goodwill of the Father, Who would not that His power should seem broken or His wisdom stultified[1]. Perfection is the end which God has in view for His people, and this end is accomplished by a system of Divine accommodation and instruction[2]. "In a multitude of ways God sought to bring the human race into the harmony of salvation[3]." This operation and economy God controlled Himself[4], and it was planned for the benefit of man[5], that all who believe in Him may advance and be perfected in salvation through the Testaments[6]. This salvation has been sketched out by God as an artist[7]. It is one. For there is one salvation and one God, but there are many precepts which form a man, and not a few steps

[1] omnis dispositio salutis, quae circa hominem fuit, secundum placitum fiebat Patris, uti non vinceretur Deus neque infirmaretur ars ejus.

[2] IV. 37. 7, praefiniente Deo omnia ad hominis perfectionem et ad aedificationem et manifestationem dispositionum uti et bonitas ostendatur et justitia perficiatur; III. 12. 11, eam quae est secundum Moysem legem et gratiam Novi Testamenti, utraque apta temporibus, ad utilitatem humani generis; V. 1. 1, non aliter nos discere poteramus quae sunt Dei, nisi magister noster, verbum exsistens, homo factus fuisset.

[3] IV. 14. 2, multis modis componens humanum genus ad consonantiam salutis.

[4] I. 10. 3, *τὴν πραγματείαν καὶ οἰκονομίαν τοῦ θεοῦ τὴν ἐπὶ τῇ ἀνθρωπότητι γενομένην*, cf. IV. 36. 6, convocat ad salutem Pater.

[5] IV. 20. 7, ad utilitatem hominum propter quos fecit tantas dispositiones, hominibus quidem ostendens Deum, Deo autem exhibens hominem. IV. 14. 2, He chose the patriarchs, *propter illorum salutem*.

[6] IV. 9. 3, ut possint semper proficere credentes in eum et per testamenta maturescere perfectum salutis; cf. IV. 37. 7, et tandem aliquando maturus fiat homo in tantis maturescens ad videndum et capiendum Deum.

[7] IV. 14. 2, fabricationem salutis, ut architectus, delineans.

which lead to God[1]. The educating work of the law has already been described in chapter XI. The four "catholic covenants" or testaments of III. 11. 8 are but different educational processes in the scheme of God for man's salvation, culminating in the manifestation of the Incarnate Word. A new era was inaugurated when the Word arranged after a new manner His advent in the flesh, that He might restore our humanity which had departed from God to God[2]. The knowledge of salvation is the knowledge of the Son of God, Who is both Salvation and Saviour. He is Saviour because He is the Son and Word of God. He is saving (salutare) because He is Spirit; and He is Salvation because He was flesh[3]. Again he says "to follow the Saviour is to share in salvation[4]." "What God seeks from man is faith, obedience and righteousness for their own salvation[5]." It is, however, "impossible for man to be saved of himself; but with the help of God he can be saved[6]." "Therefore the Word tabernacled in humanity, and became the Son of Man, that He might accustom man to receive God and God to dwell in man according to the Father's pleasure[7]." "Neither can we be saved without the Spirit[8]." Therefore, "we are made spiritual in Christ, laying down not the handiwork of God, but the desires of the flesh, and receiving the Holy Spirit[9]."

[1] IV. 9. 3, una enim salus et unus Deus: quae autem formant hominem praecepta multa, et non pauci gradus qui ducunt hominem ad Deum.

[2] III. 10. 2.

[3] III. 10. 3.

[4] IV. 14. 1, sequi enim salvatorem participare est salutem.

[5] IV. 17. 4, propter illorum salutem.

[6] III. 20. 2, "for it was the Lord Himself who saved them, *non a nobis sed a Deo adjumento habuimus salvari.*

[7] III. 20. 2, ut assuesceret hominem percipere Deum et assuesceret Deum habitare in homine.

[8] V. 9. 2, sine Spiritu Dei salvari non possumus.

[9] V. 12. 3, προσλαβόντες τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον; V. 12. 2, προσλαβόμενος τὸ ζωοποιοῦν πνεῦμα εὑρήσει τὴν ζωήν.

"The Spirit envelops man within and without and never leaves Him." "With Him we must live in fellowship, lest losing Him we lose life[1]." "By the Spirit we obtain the similitude of God[2]," and "shall be perfectly and effectually made, after the image and likeness of God[3]." But as man is a free agent, his cooperation is required. Man must repent and be converted to God[4]. "Man must be just and holy and keep His commandments and abide in His love[5]." He must "fear God, believe in the Incarnation, and have the Spirit of God established by faith in his heart[6]." He must desire the light if he wishes to enjoy it, "guard the form in which he has been made by keeping his heart soft and tractable[7]." "And man must in addition to his calling be adorned with the works of righteousness, that the Spirit may rest upon him[8]."

If we imitate His actions, and perform His words, we shall have communion with Him[9]. "He who abides in the deeds of the flesh is carnal, because he does not *receive the Spirit of God*, and cannot possess the Kingdom of heaven, but the man who shall improve and produce the

[1] *ibid.* [2] v. 6. 1. [3] v. 8. 1.

[4] III. 10. 3, agnitionem salutis faciebat Johannes poenitentiam agentibus, cf. Vg. Mt. 3. 2, poenitentiam agite; I. 10. 1, *τοῖς δὲ ἐκ μετανοίας ζωὴν χαρισάμενος*. Public confession of notorious sins was sometimes required. *εἰς φανερὸν ἐξομολογοῦνται* (I. 13. 7). Those who like the devil and his angels persist in evil works *sine poenitentia et sine regressu* will be punished with him in eternal fire, III. 23. 3, IV. 40. 1. But for those who repent and are converted to Him God maketh peace and friendship and at-one-ment (*ἕνωσιν συντιθέμενος*), IV. 40. 1. In IV. 37. 1 he quotes Rom. ii. 4, "the goodness of God leadeth thee to repentance."

[5] I. 10. 1.

[6] v. 9. 1, per fidem constituunt in cordibus suis Spiritum.

[7] IV. 39. 2.

[8] cum vocatione et justitiae operibus adornari uti requiescat super nos Spiritus Dei, IV. 36. 6.

[9] v. 1. 1, ut imitatores quidem operum, factores autem sermonum ejus facti, communionem habeamus cum Ipso.

fruit of the Spirit is being saved in every way on account of the fellowship of the Spirit....The things that save, he says (St Paul), are the name of our Lord Jesus Christ and the Spirit of our God[1]." "There is glory and honour to every man that worketh good[2]," and peace of soul with God and friendship with Him and At-one-ment for those who repent and are converted unto God[3].

In his ethical and religious system of salvation Irenaeus insists upon certain fundamental principles. He recognized that salvation is a process, a growth[4], a gradual development in the grace of a new spiritual life, which is obtained through the life-giving Spirit, and which is lived in communion with the Father and the Son, and in the fellowship of the Divine Spirit, Who confers spiritual peace, knowledge, and immortality and life upon the soul. To enjoy this life one must repent of one's sins, turn to God, control one's evil desires, *assume the Spirit of God*, bring forth the fruit of the Spirit: and walk in newness of life and in obedience to God[5]. There is no doubt that Irenaeus lays a certain stress upon an obedient and an active faith, but he also emphasizes the necessity of receiving the Spirit of God in order to live the new life that is hidden with Christ in God. It is not correct to say that "with Irenaeus the practical life seems to have its source, at least according to the form in which he expresses it, in the

[1] v. 11. 1, *quod non assumat Spiritum Dei*...in melius profecerit et fructum operatus fuerit Spiritus omni modo salvatur propter Spiritus communionem...ea autem quae salvant, ait esse nomen Domini nostri Jesu Christi et Spiritum Dei nostri.

[2] Rom. ii. 10, IV. 37. 1.

[3] IV. 40. 1, ἕνωσιν συντιθέμενος = making at-one-ment.

[4] Notice use of maturescere and maturus IV. 9. 3 and IV. 37. 7 in this connection.

[5] v. 9. 2.

man himself, and the impulse is furnished by the certainty that each individual act is to be rewarded or punished by God in accordance with its nature[1]"; for he expressly says that man cannot be saved of himself without the help of God, and without the Spirit of God[2].

Neither is it quite fair to Irenaeus to say that "it was chiefly as a temporal event that the results of the forgiveness of sins were regarded[3]." Such an explanation could hardly be given of the passage in V. 12. 2, "Just as he who was made a living soul lost his life by following the worse course, so the same man by returning to the better course and receiving the life-giving Spirit—'the Spirit of the remission of sins by Whom we are quickened[4]'—shall find life." Forgiveness in this system counteracts the results of sin that destroys the life by causing man to lose the life-giving Spirit, and prevents man from attaining the perfection of salvation[5], the spiritual likeness of God in Christ, and the eternal possession of His Spirit. And the results of forgiveness are peace of soul, the friendship and fellowship of God, the presence of His Spirit in our lives, and the walking in newness of life[6]. Surely this forgiveness

[1] Stewart Means, *St Paul and the Ante-Nicene Church*, p. 188. This statement like others in this work is due to hasty generalization, e.g. he also says, "Irenaeus nowhere speaks of prayer," p. 189, but see II. 32. 5 where he describes the efficacy of the Church's prayer; IV. 18. 6, "There is an altar in heaven, thither our prayers are directed," his own beautiful prayer for his readers, III. 6. 3, and IV. 17. 5, "Incense, as John says in the Apocalypse, is the *prayers* of the Saints."

[2] III. 20. 2, V. 9. 2.

[3] So Werner, *Der Paulinismus des Irenäus*, S. 144: "Die Sünde Vergebung ist bei Iren. aus einer religiosen Thatsache zu einem historischen Ereigniss im Leben des Menschen geworden. Sie ist einmaliger Act den der Mensch erleidet, nicht eine stete Gottestat, die er immer von neuem in ihrer beseligenden Kraft wieder erfahrt."

[4] Spiritum remissionis peccatorum per quem vivificamur.

[5] maturescere perfectum salutis, IV. 9. 3: maturescens ad videndum et capiendum Deum, IV. 37. 7, V. 36. 2.

[6] in novitate vitae ambulemus, obedientes Deo, V. 9. 2.

is a religious factor in man's spiritual life and has reference primarily to his internal state.

In this salvation there is no distinction of Jew and Gentile[1]. He says, however, that the former had the advantage over the latter, having already in their law the principles of morality and the unity of God, which the Gentiles do not yet understand[2]. As theologians of the Middle Ages hotly debated the question whether Samson, Solomon and Origen were saved, there was a controversy in the second century regarding the salvation of Adam. In this discussion Irenaeus maintained the affirmative while Tatian held the negative[3]. Irenaeus also believed that salvation was, theoretically, not merely universal but also comprehensive, embracing the whole man, body, soul and spirit. The flesh shares in the salvation of the man. "It assumes the quality of the Spirit, when possessed by the Spirit, and is made conformable to the Word of God[4]." The limbs that are possessed by the Spirit are translated into the kingdom of God[5]. Irenaeus evidently held that there was some process by which the flesh was absorbed in the strength of the Spirit, was drawn up into it, and lost the memory of itself in the new life of the Spirit[6]. In this way the clay that is in us is concealed by the work of God[7]. At the resurrection man is not simply reanimated; he is

[1] III. 5. 3, in unum collegit et univit eos qui longe et eos qui prope, hoc est circumcisionem et praeputiationem, dilatans Japhet et constituens eum in domo Sem, see Eph. ii. 17; cf. IV. 25. 1, in unam fidem Abrahae colligens eos qui ex utroque Testamento apti sunt in aedificationem Dei.

[2] IV. 24. 2, quapropter plus laborabat qui in gentes apostolatum acceperat quam qui in circumcisione praeconabat.

[3] I. 28. 1, III. 22. 2, III. 23. 7, etc.

[4] V. 9. 2. [5] V. 9. 4.

[6] V. 9. 2, Spiritus rursus absorbens infirmitatem haereditate possidet carnem in se...caro a Spiritu possessa oblita sui.

[7] IV. 39. 2, ab artificio Dei absconditur quod est in te lutum.

renewed, his form is other (praetereunte figura hac, renovato homine, v. 36. 1).

At the same time he was restrained from any speculations of his own on the subject by his present controversy with the Gnostics, who denied the redemption of the body: "If the flesh be not saved," he argues, "our Lord did not redeem us with His blood," neither is the cup of the Eucharist the communion of His Blood, nor is the bread we break the communion of His Body[1]. "The Lord came to save the substance of the flesh, that as in Adam all die, being psychical, in Christ we may live because spiritual[2]." He also maintains that as our bodies are nourished by the Eucharist, which is the Body and Blood of Christ, and which consists of the fruits of the earth, bread and wine, which receiving the Word of God become a Eucharist, so "when they have been placed in the ground and have suffered dissolution in it, they shall arise at the proper time, the Word of God giving them a resurrection to the glory of our God and Father[3]." He is careful to insist that we have not life in ourselves, of our own nature, but of God's excellent greatness[4]. He evidently intends a parallel to be drawn between the bread and wine which receiving the Word of God (*προσλαμβανόμενα τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ*) becomes a Eucharist and our humanity which after receiving the Spirit of God (*προσλαβόμενος τὸ ζωοποιοῦν πνεῦμα*[5]) becomes here endowed with life and is raised by the Word of God hereafter. "But the fruit or result of the work of the Spirit is the salvation of the flesh. For what other apparent result is there of the Spirit, Who is not apparent, than the rendering of the flesh ripe for and

[1] v. 2. 1. [2] v. 12. 3. [3] v. 2. 3.
[4] v. 2. 3, *ἐκ τῆς ὑπεροχῆς*. [5] v. 12. 2.

capable of immortality[1]"? "As our Lord pierced the shades of death where the souls of the dead are, and after His resurrection was taken up into heaven, so the souls of His disciples shall withdraw into the invisible place appointed for them by God and there shall await the resurrection, and after it, receiving back their bodies, and rising in their entirety, that is, in the body as the Lord arose, shall so come into the presence of God[2]." The flesh must share, he insists, in the salvation and resurrection of man. "For God raising our mortal bodies that *keep righteousness*, will render them immortal and incorruptible, for He is stronger than nature, and has in Himself the Will because He is good, the power because He is Almighty, and the accomplishment because He is resourceful and perfect[3]."

Sorrow and death play an important part in the salvation of man. "Tribulation is necessary"—he writes with a reference to its literal meaning and derivation from *tribulum*, a threshing machine—"for those who are in a state of salvation, that so being, as it were, broken up, made fine and well kneaded (*conspersi*) or leavened through suffering by the Word of God, they may be

[1] V. 12. 4, maturam efficere carnem et capacem incorruptelae. This seems to imply some change in this life preparatory to the life eternal owing to a participation in Deity, "si quaedam salvat propter suam participationem, quaedam autem non" (II. 29. 1).

[2] V. 31. 2, περιμένουσαι τὴν ἀνάστασιν, a more suggestive phrase is in V. 5. 1, προοιμιαζομένους τὴν ἀφθαρσίαν of the souls in Paradise who are making a prelude or a preparation there of their immortality. He calls it *refrigerii locus* in II. 29. 1: cf. IV. 27. 4 where he has *refrigerium* (Vg. requiem) in 2 Thess. i. 7.

[3] II. 29. 1, corpora nostra *custodientia* justitiam, cf. IV. 39. 2, custodi figuram qua te figuravit'artifex...custodiens compaginationem (the joining) ascendes ad perfectum...ordinem hominis custodire deinde, participare gloriae Dei. An excellent simile drawn from modelling in clay of the relation of the work of God to the cooperation of man in man's salvation, considered as the workmanship of God. Righteousness is evidently the moisture he refers to there, "habens in temetipso *humorem* ne induratus amittas vestigia digitorum ejus."

kindled with enthusiasm and prepared for the banquet of the King. As one of us said in the arena when condemned to die, 'I am the wheat of God, and am being ground by the teeth of wild beasts that I may be found the pure bread of God[1].'" These sentences on the sacramental efficacy of personal suffering find a modern echo in Longfellow's translation from the German:

> The mills of God grind slowly, but they grind exceeding small;
> So soft and slow the great wheels go, they scarcely move at all,
> But the souls of men fall into them, and are powdered into dust,
> And in the dust grow three sweet flowers, Love—Hope—Trust;

and are ascribed to Ignatius in the Greek *Acts* of that martyr[2].

With regard to death he wrote: "For God set a bound to the sin of man by the interposition of death, and thus caused sin to cease, putting an end to it by the dissolution of the flesh which was to take place in the ground, so that man, ceasing to live to sin, should begin to live to God[3]." And death, the blow received in Adam, shall be healed by the resurrection. It is emptied of its sting and power by Christ[4]. "But it is the duty of the Christian to study how to die[5]."

In conclusion, salvation in this system included the full realization of all that God intended man to become in body, soul and spirit. Development in this direction was arrested by the sin of man, but received a new starting-point from the Incarnation of the Word, and will be carried still further when man, embracing the Word of God, shall ascend to Him, rising above the angels and attaining the image and likeness of God[6].

[1] v. 28. 3.
[2] In the Bodleian library.
[3] III. 23. 6.
[4] III. 23. 7.
[5] Frag. XI. (Harvey).
[6] v. 36. 2.

Then the Church shall be fashioned after the image of His Son[1] and men shall ascend "ad perfectum[2]."

The Future Hope.

The eschatology of Irenaeus was strongly coloured by material views of a millennium. He had not outgrown the carnal hopes of an earthly kingdom that were founded on the Jewish expectations of a Messianic realm incorporated in the Apocalyptic literature of the Jews and the Apocalypse of the New Testament, and fostered in the village communities of Asia Minor. Justin Martyr, an advocate of these views, allows that they were not acceptable to many Christians of pure and devout mind.

Irenaeus sets forth his opinion on these matters in his last book. The five chapters 32—37 of this book were not found in the manuscripts used by Erasmus, but were unearthed by Feuardent, who asserted that they were from the hand of Irenaeus and that they had been omitted on account of their pronounced chiliastic views[3]. They are only in the Voss MS., and Stieren states that there is a marginal note by a later hand in that MS. to the effect that what follows even to the end is wanting in all copies. They display a curious blending of the mystical and the material in the expositions of the book of Daniel and the Apocalypse, but are not without a certain interest.

[1] IV. 37. 7, ecclesia ad figuram imaginis Filii coaptetur.

[2] IV. 39. 2, custodiens compaginationem *ascendes ad perfectum*.

[3] The last two books of this treatise have been found in an Armenian translation along with the *Apostolic Preaching*, and presumably these last chapters. Ch. III. of the tract concludes with a clear echo of the conclusion of the treatise on the ascent of man: "damit wir nicht der gestorbenen Menschen sondern des ewigen und beständigen Gottes Kinder seien; damit das Ewige und Beständige (in uns?) Gott werde und hoch über einem jeden der Gewordenen stehe, und ihm Alles unterstellt werde" (Harnack's edition).

For instance, in V. 30. 3 we have the earliest attempt on record to interpret the number of the beast[1]. The number 666 is, according to him, the representation of the summing-up of all the wickedness which took place in the world, i.e. the *Apostasia.* In V. 30. 1 he mentions another reading, 616, which he considers the result of a copyist's error. In c. 25 he describes the pomp and parade of this tyranny of Antichrist in the words of Daniel[2], and in c. 26 continues the subject with the additional light of the Apocalypse of St John. The conclusion is stated in V. 26. 2, where he appeals, as in his *Apostolic Preaching*, to the argument from prophecy as final. Other prophecies have been fulfilled, why should not these things come to pass? He quotes the saying of Justin, that "Satan had never dared to blaspheme God before the Incarnation, for he was not aware before that event of his own condemnation."

The Judgement is described in V. 27. 1. Christ returned for the ruin of those who do not believe in Him, and they shall receive a worse punishment than Sodom and Gomorrha, but for the resurrection of those who believe and do the will of the Heavenly Father. The fate of the ungodly is not annihilation but eternal separation. "Their punishment has been self-chosen and self-inflicted. The man who chooses sin by his own act separates himself from God; but he that believeth is united with God by faith....The good is eternal and without end in God. The loss of such must be eternal[3]."

According to Valentinus, Christ separates the spiritual man from the material man, and saves the spiritual class alone. Origen would have all spirits finally saved

[1] Rev. xiii. 18. [2] c. 7. [3] V. 27. 2.

and glorified, in order to serve in a non-sensuous sphere. But Irenaeus would separate the good from the evil, the former being reunited with Christ in eternal glory, and the rest left in outer darkness which is eternal. The punishment is not inflicted by God directly[1] but follows them on account of their loss of what is good.

Then shall Antichrist be destroyed, and the Sabbath of the Lord, the thousand years of the rule of the saints, shall be ushered in. "This earthly kingdom is the beginning of incorruption. By means of it they who are worthy are gradually accustomed to comprehend God. The righteous must first rise again in this creation, which is renovated, rising in order to serve God, and rule in the promised inheritance; and then the Judgement shall take place. For it is fitting that in the very creation in which they toiled and suffered and were proved every way by afflictions, they should obtain the reward of their endurance, and that where they were slain they should recover life, and should rule where they were held in thraldom. For God is rich in everything and all things belong to Him[2]." The promise to Abraham of land which he was to inherit with his seed, that is, those who[3] fear God and believe in Him ("For his seed is the Church through the adoption of the Lord," V. 32. 2), the benediction of Jacob, and the mention of the fruit of the vine[4], are pressed into the argument,

[1] *ibid.* προηγητικῶς. In this passage he speaks of the punishment of sin as self-inflicted and as of a negative kind, such as the blinding of one's own eyes prevents one from seeing the sun. But in V. 27. 1 he spoke of the *aeternus ignis*, prepared for the devil and his angels, the *ignis inextinguibilis* and the *ruina* of the evil, punishment of a positive kind. In V. 28. 1 he combines both forms: "illos in aeternum ignem missurum (sc. Verbum Dei). Semetipsos enim omnibus privaverunt bonis," and seems to waver between the popular and materialistic view of punishment and the ethical and spiritual view.

[2] V. 32. 1. [3] V. 32. 2. [4] V. 33. 1.

which terminates with the words of Papias regarding the vines with a thousand branches, etc.[1] He concludes with a list of prophecies from Isaiah, Ezekiel, Jeremiah, Daniel, Baruch, and the Apocalypse of St John.

In the last chapter (36) he completes his sketch of the progress of man in the future life and in the way of incorruption. "For since men are real theirs must be a real establishment. They do not vanish into non-existence, but progress among existent things. Neither the matter nor the substance of creation is annihilated[2], the form alone passes. When this fashion has passed away and man has been renewed and advances vigorously towards incorruption, so that he shall no longer grow old, there shall be the new heaven and the new earth, in which the man shall remain ever new among the new, always holding communion with God." "As the presbyters say: 'Then they who have proved worthy of an abode in Heaven shall go there; some shall possess the glory of the city, and others the delight of Paradise, for everywhere the Saviour shall be seen as they who see Him shall prove worthy.' This they say is the distinction between the habitation of those who produce sixtyfold and thirtyfold. These presbyters, the disciples of the Apostles, declare that such is the orderly progress of those who are being saved and that it is by steps of this kind that we advance. They also say that we ascend through the Spirit to the Son and through the Son to the Father; and that, then, the Son will place the work in the Father's hands. 'The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death.' For in the times of the kingdom

[1] v. 33. 3.

[2] Irenaeus was aware of the indestructibility and transmutation of matter and doubtless of the conservation of energy.

the righteous man shall forget to die....So shall the creation contain and be contained by the Word, and man shall rise higher than the angels, ascending to the Word, and he shall be made after the image and likeness of God[1]." So shall we value the Divine purpose of our existence, for we shall share his glory[2] and we shall have immortality[3]. With this splendid conception of spiritual advance in the future life we may compare the thought of Whichcote: "I am apt to think that in the heavenly hereafter, when God shall otherwise declare Himself than He doth, those latent powers which now we have, may open and unfold themselves, and thereby we may be able to act in a far higher way."

[1] v. 36. 3.

[2] IV. 14. 1, Dominus qui formavit et ad hoc praeparavit nos ut dum sumus cum eo participemus gloriae ejus. See whole passage.

[3] IV. 4. 3, temporalia fecit propter hominem ut maturescens in eis fructificet immortalitatem.

CHAPTER XVII

THE APOSTOLIC PREACHING

It seems to be the fate of the writings of Irenaeus to be preserved only in translations and quotations. We are, however, grateful to those whose studies have preserved them, even in that manner. While the treatise was his *magnum opus*, a letter dedicated to one Marcianus, and containing a proof of the Apostolic teaching, was among his writings mentioned by Eusebius[1]. An Armenian version of this was discovered in 1904 in the library of the church at Erivan, by an Armenian priest, who, with a colleague, edited the text, with a German translation, highly commended by Dr Harnack and published by him in *Texte und Untersuchungen*, 1907. With regard to the Armenian translation, Dr Conybeare says that he has not the least doubt that it belongs to the golden age of that literature, and is as old as 450 A.D. He cannot understand why the editor places it so late as 650 to 750, still less how he can for a moment doubt that a Greek original rather than a Syriac underlies it. "From beginning to end it shows none of the Syriac forms so frequent in Armenian versions made from the Syriac, such as those of the History of Eusebius and of the Homilies of Aphraat[2]." The Armenian version

[1] *H.E.* v. 26. [2] *Expositor*, July 1907.

also contains the last two books against the *Heresies*. In IV. 7. 1 of that version the *Magnificat* is assigned to Elisabeth, in agreement with the Clermont and Voss MSS. of the Latin and Niceta of Remesiana. The Greek title of the tract in Eusebius[1] is εἰς ἐπίδειξιν τοῦ ἀποστολικοῦ κηρύγματος, "For a demonstration of the Apostolic Preaching." In *Adv. Haer.* II. 35. 4 he refers to "Apostolorum dictatio" among other branches of catechetical instruction, such as "Domini magisterium," "prophetarum annuntiatio" and "legislationis ministratio." And in c. 45 of this tract he refers to the *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*, which might possibly be the well-known *Didaché*, although Dr Harnack does not think so. This tract is saturated with the expressions and ideas of the treatise. He refers to "the economy of our redemption[2]" and the "economy of the incarnation[3]," of which he had spoken in *Adv. Haer.* I. 10. 1, and says "the holy oil" of Ps. xlv. is the Holy Spirit with Whom Christ is anointed[4], while in the treatise, III. 18. 3, he writes: "The Father anointing, the Son anointed, and the Spirit the Unction." "All the principal points of the religious teaching of the *Adv. Haer.* are to be found here," writes Dr Harnack. "They were not theology but religion to Irenaeus." Echoes of the Gnostic controversy are heard now and again, but the chief object of the book is to point out how Judaism leads up to and proves Christianity. The Jews are, indeed, the great proof of Christianity. "The Jews, Sir!" Marcianus seems to have been wavering between the two. The tract itself throws no new light upon the life of the great bishop, but it shows how systematic was his mind and how deep and kindly was his interest

[1] v. 26. [2] c. 47. [3] c. 99. [4] c. 47.

in his people. And as Dr Harnack says, "We learn from it how strong and living were the thoughts which he had developed in his work *Adversus Haereses*."

We have an allusion to the treatise in c. 99 of the tract, where he indicates the three groups of heresies concerning God the Father, God the Son and God the Holy Ghost, which he says he has exposed in "the Refutation and Detection of so-called science." The tract was, therefore, written after his great treatise. There is also a reference to the political situation and the state of the Church in c. 48, where he speaks of "kings who now hate Him and persecute His name," an allusion to the persecution of Severus, so that the just inference is that the tract was composed about that time. The Scriptural quotations are chiefly from the Old Testament. Some of these are after the version of Justin, and in some places similar to the LXX, but in others they show independence and closer relation to the Hebrew[1]. One fact of interest connected with the phrasing of the tract is the use of Justin's works. There are also many affinities, literary and spiritual, with our Church Catechism. The work itself consists of (1) Introduction, (2) the history of the revelation of God and of His plan for man's salvation from the Creation to the entry into Canaan, (3) the prophecies from the Psalms, Isaiah, Jeremiah and the minor prophets concerning Christ, (4) Conclusion and Summary.

The introduction contains the address to Marcianus, whose faith he desires to confirm, and, accordingly, he sends him this little book, "the preaching of the truth," to have by him as a concise account of all the articles

[1] See *Journal of Theological Studies*, Sept. 1907, Article: "The Apostolic Preaching of Irenaeus," by the present writer.

of the faith, or, as Irenaeus describes it, "all the members of the body of truth." Marcianus may have had a tendency to lapse back into Judaism. Irenaeus says rather pointedly in c. 95, "We dare not return to the first legislation," and the whole trend of his argument is to prove that the promises to Abraham were fulfilled in Christ and inherited by the Gentiles. The prophets, therefore, rather than the Gospels, are laid under contribution. The anti-Judaic character of the book may also reflect the style of the earliest catechisms of the Christian Church, and may be compared in this regard with Justin Martyr's *Apologia*. Prof. Rendel Harris would refer this instruction back to an original work against the Jews entitled *Testimonies against the Jews*[1].

The aim of the tract is not merely to inculcate correct belief, but also right conduct. It touches the practical side, while the treatise is rather concerned with the speculative side of religious life. The tract, however, throws an interesting light on his doctrine of the Trinity[2]. That is the basis of the work[3], as it is of the Church Catechism. Like that Catechism, it also insists on personal purity as well as on true belief[4]. And, like the Catechism, it places Holy Baptism in the forefront of the instruction[5]. The second chapter concludes with a description of the heretics: "They sit in the seat of the *wicked*, and *corrupt* those who receive the poison of their teaching." And then he proceeds to say, "Now, in order that we suffer not such (poison), we must hold the canon of the Faith steadfastly, and perform the commandments of

[1] *Expositor*, March 1907.
[2] *Hermathena* 1907, *Apostolic Preaching of Irenaeus and its Light on his Doctrine of the Trinity*, by the present writer.
[3] See Chapter 6. [4] c. 2. [5] c. 3.

God, *believing* in God and *fearing* Him as He is Lord, and *loving* Him as our Father. Doing proceeds from believing....And now whereas the *faith is the constant preserver of our salvation*, it is necessary to pay much attention to it, that we may gain a true insight into the realities. It is the *faith* that gives us this, the faith as the elders, the disciples of the Apostles[1], have handed it down to us. First of all it teaches us to remember that we have received Baptism for the forgiveness of sins in the Name of God the Father, and in the Name of Jesus Christ, the Son of God, Who became incarnate, and died and rose again, and in the Holy Spirit of God, and that this Baptism is the seal of everlasting life and regeneration into God; so *that we are the children of the everlasting God*[2]; and that the eternal and constant God may be in us...and that God may be the sovereign of all and that all may be of God." "Therefore," he writes in c. 7, "the baptism of our regeneration proceeds through these three points, while God the Father *graciously*[3] leads us[4] by means of His Son through the Holy Spirit to our regeneration. For they who carry the Spirit of God in themselves are led to the Word, that is, to the Son; but the Son leads them to the Father, and the Father allows them to receive incorruption[5]."

Compare with these words the answers in the first part of the Catechism, especially: "In my Baptism wherein I was made a *child of God*"; "That I should

[1] Cf. *Adv. Haer.* v. 36. 1. The presbyters, the disciples of the Apostles.

[2] Cf. "the Gospel of our adoption" (*Kindschaft*), c. 8.

[3] Cf. 8, God is "barmherzig, gnädig, huldreich."

[4] begnadet, gnade=gratia. Cf. χαρισάμενος ἀφθαρσίαν (as act of grace) (1. 10. 1).

[5] Cf. *Adv. Haer.* v. 36. 2, per Spiritum quidem ad Filium, per Filium autem ascendere ad Patrem; IV. 20. 5, Spiritu praeparante hominem in Filium Dei, Filio adducente ad Patrem, Patre autem incorruptelam donante

renounce the devil and all his works...and all the sinful lusts of the flesh"; "that I should believe all the articles of the Christian faith, that I should keep God's holy will and commandments, and walk in the same all the days of my life"; "I heartily thank our heavenly Father that He hath called me to this *state of salvation* through Jesus Christ our Saviour. And I pray unto God to give me *His grace* that I may continue in the same unto my life's end." Also notice that the Catechism bases right conduct on right belief, and rehearses the Creed before the Commandments. Similarly Irenaeus in cc. 4, 5, 6 gives a summary, with explanations, of the true faith in God the Father, God the Son and God the Holy Spirit. This, he says, "is the canon of our belief, the foundation of our building and the security of our walk": cf. "walk in the same all the days of my life": while the conclusion of the tract, cc. 87—100, which Dr Harnack pronounces the most important portion of the work, is an expansion of the words of Matthew xxii. 37: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart and with all thy soul and with all thy mind," "and the second is like unto it, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself"—which are also expanded in "my duty towards God" and "my duty towards my neighbour." "The love of God," he writes in c. 95, "is far from all sin, and love to one's neighbour works no ill to one's neighbour." Cf. Greek Fragment IV: "In as far as one can do good to one's neighbour and does it not, he must be considered a stranger to the love of God." This principle is applied to the Decalogue in c. 96, with the same searching inwardness, so that love is shown to "be the fulfilling of the law[1]." In the same

[1] Cited c. 87.

chapter[1] he combines the three leading ideas of our Church Catechism, faith, love, duty, in one telling phrase: "He (the Lord) has through faith in Him developed our love to God and to our neighbour by which we become pious, and righteous and good."

The greater part of the tract is, however, concerned with the Old Testament prophecies relating to the Messiah as Son of God, as Preexistent, as Incarnate, Crucified, Risen and Ascended, and as our future Judge. His work in connection with the Old Testament history is explained as to a catechumen, and the Scriptures are interpreted in the same allegorical manner of "seeking the type" which he had followed in the treatise[2]. An interesting quotation from Baruch[3] occurs in c. 97. The principal verse[4]—"Afterward did he shew himself upon earth and conversed (or walked) with men" is also cited in the treatise[5], and the same application is made in both passages—"through Whom (Christ) there is union and communion between God and man." Communion with God established through Christ; immortality conferred on man by the Father, Son and Holy Spirit; and the image and likeness of God restored to man by both the Son and Holy Spirit—these are the three points round which the mind of Irenaeus revolves both in the treatise and the tract.

The most remarkable statement in the *Apostolic Preaching*[6] is that Pontius Pilate was the Procurator of Claudius (A.D. 41—54). This was evidently due to a desire to make the sentence under Pilate agree with the date required by those who held that our Lord lived

[1] c. 87.
[2] typum quaerere IV. 31. 1.
[3] III. 29—IV. 1.
[4] III. 37.
[5] IV. 20. 3.
[6] c. 74.

over forty years[1]. We find many echoes of the treatise and of Justin's *Apologia* and *Dialogue* in this tract. We have the same parallels of Mary and Eve, and of the tree of knowledge and the Cross; the *recapitulatio*, the summing-up of all things in Christ; the prophetic Spirit; the name Immanuel; the jealousy of the Devil; the indescribable generation of the Christ. Many of his own phrases, slightly altered, occur, e.g. "the rule of the truth" becomes "the rule of the faith," the Son is "the image of God" in the tract, the "visible of the Father" in the treatise. The perfection of man, the resurrection of the body, the obedience of Christ[2], the adoption in Christ, His Incarnation, Virgin-Birth, the Church as the Seed of Abraham, Adam and Eve in the Garden represented as boy and girl, innocent and virgin, created from the virgin soil[3], the free will and responsibility of man, and the founding of the Churches by the Apostles—these and many other topics are treated in the same way in both the treatise and the tract.

It is interesting to note that he has taken over from the Gnostics "the seven heavens" of which he writes[4] in both treatise and tract, but that he has abandoned his old explanation of the name Satan, which he interpreted as "apostate" in *Adv. Haer.* V. 21. 2, but which he explained in the tract[5] as meaning "adversary." This is doubtless the reason why we do not meet the *Apostasia*, which figures so largely in the treatise, e.g. V. 1. 1, and which represents the rule of Satan. In c. 47 he says, "His fellows are the prophets, the righteous ones, and the Apostles and all they *who have part in the*

[1] Cf. *Adv. Haer.* II. 22. 4, and John viii. 51.
[2] c. 31, and III. 20. 2.
[3] III. 22. 3 and cc. 12, 32.
[4] 1. 5. 2, and c. 9.
[5] c. 16.

fellowship of His kingdom, that is, His disciples"—words which find an echo in the ancient collect from the Sacramentary of Leo for the Third Sunday after Easter —"Grant unto all them *that are admitted into the fellowship of Christ's religion* that they may eschew those things that are contrary to their profession, and follow all such things as are agreeable to the same."

In conclusion, there is one New Testament reading to be noted, *vinegar* (ὄξος) for *wine* (οἶνον) in Matthew xxvii. 34. In this he keeps company with Cod. Alex. and Cod. Sangall., "written in Latin (most probably by Irish) monks in the West of Europe during the ninth (rather tenth) century[1]." This is an interesting link between the Celtic Church of Ireland and Irenaeus. There is an indirect reference to Heb. xii. 23, "the assembly of the first-born." He distinctly ascribes John i. 14 to "His disciple John[2]" in c. 94, and John i. 1 in c. 43 to "His disciple John"—another link between the *Apostle* John and the Fourth Gospel.

[1] Scrivener.
[2] Johannes discipulus Domini. *Adv. Haer.* IV. 30.

CHAPTER XVIII

GNOSTICISM, ANCIENT AND MODERN

WE shall now give Irenaeus' account of the principal schools of ancient Gnosticism which are chiefly interesting to those who have some knowledge of the occult philosophy of the east, and especially important to those who are studying the argument for Christianity against the many forms in which Gnosticism has recently reappeared among us.

The record of Gnostic speculation is somewhat uninteresting reading, and yet one must, in some measure, attempt to form some idea of its various systems, which present, in a strange and repellent dialect, many anticipations of the transcendentalism of the last generation[1] and of the Spiritualism and Christian Science of our own.

[1] Bishop Westcott, *Essays*, p. 201. The *Pistis Sophia* throws light upon the Valentinian Gnosis and Sacramental System. This is a Gnostic work, in a Coptic MS. now in the British Museum, assigned by Petermann and Köstlin to one of the large groups of the Ophite sects. The Ophites are described in Irenaeus (I. 29 et sq.) and also by Origen, Hippolytus, Epiphanius and Theodoret. Their symbol of nature was the serpent which they took over from the Phœnicians and Egyptians. In one Gnostic system Nous is described as serpent-formed (I. 30. 5); in another Sophia herself is identified with the serpent. Although it might be imagined that the Greeks were anthropomorphic in their ideas, it is believed, even if not proved, that Zeus Meilichios was originally a serpent into whose temple the Zeus in human form intruded. See Miss Harrison's *Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion*, pp. 19—21, where reliefs show snakeworship in Athens and Boeotia. "The colossal size of the beast as it towers above its human worshippers is the *Magnificat* of the artist." Cf. the serpents of Virgil's *Aeneid* II. 199, et sq.

The most popular system of the Gnostics in the eastern provinces of Rome was the Valentinian. According to Hippolytus it was derived from the wisdom of Egypt and the *Timaeus* of Plato (VI. 22). Irenaeus describes it as a recapitulation of all the heresies (Praef. IV.). He says he studied the records (*ὑπομνήματα*) of the sect (Praef. I.) and states that Valentinus came to Rome in the time of Hyginus, flourished in the time of Pius and remained until the bishopric of Anicetus (III. 4. 2). This would be circ. A.D. 140—156. Marcion was also at Rome at the time imbibing speculative ideas of another kind from Cerdo. So also was Justin Martyr. We gather from a hint of Irenaeus that other churchmen before him had attempted to cope with Valentinus without success[1]. Valentinus had undoubtedly a superior type of mind that was attracted by the problems of religion and philosophy, and he tried to explain away all difficulties by an allegorical method of exegesis and an elaborate system of emanations.

Epiphanius says he was born in Egypt and studied Platonism in Alexandria, which has been described as "a vat in which the various religions of the ancient world fermented." He occupies a prominent place in all works on Gnosticism.

The positions of this theory, as described by Irenaeus, are as follows. Starting with the idea that matter was evil, and that therefore the supreme Unknown and transcendent Deity, who is described as Bythos, Proarche or Propator, had no part in connection with the Creation,

[1] hi qui ante nos fuerunt et quidem multo nobis meliores non tamen satis potuerunt contradicere his qui sunt a Valentino quia ignorabant regulam ipsorum quam nos cum omni diligentia in primo libro tibi tradidimus, *Praef.* IV. Clement of Alexandria in his *Excerpts from Theodotus* preserves fragments of this teaching.

these Gnostics filled up the void by a graduated scale of intermediaries, acting in pairs, and divided into groups of ogdoads, decads and dodecads, which they called agencies or aeons. These were all produced from the Supreme God, collectively made up the number thirty, and constituted the Pleroma. This system, Irenaeus declares, was borrowed from Plato, Democritus and the comic poets of Greece[1]. It was also based, to a large extent, upon the three Egyptian enneads or cycles of gods in which Deity was supposed to manifest Itself. The Supreme God of the Gnostics became identified with the Pleroma, or fullness, which consisted of a number of created or divine beings. The most important of these is Nous, or Monogenes, who alone has knowledge of the Supreme God, and who leads others to that knowledge. From Bythos and Sige (also called Ennoia or Charis) are produced Nous (or Monogenes) and Aletheia. From the second pair, or Syzygy, are generated Logos (the Word) and Zoe (Life), Anthropos (man) and Ecclesia (the Church). This was the first cycle of life—the ogdoad or octave. Then from Logos and Zoe are produced five pairs, called the Decad, the second cycle, and from Anthropos and Ecclesia, six pairs, styled the Dodecad, the third cycle. All these together made up the Pleroma. A solitary aeon, called Stauros (Cross) or Horos (Boundary), is employed to keep each aeon in

[1] II. 14. 1, where he points out that Antiphanes expressed similar ideas in his Theogony in which he described the birth of Chaos from Night and Silence, and the issue of Light from Love. "These things commonly acted by splendid voiced comedians they have transferred to their own system, changing the names." He compares their scheme to "a patchwork robe of borrowed rags," *centonem* ex multis et pessimis panniculis consarcientes. An example of such a *cento* is given in I. 9. 4. It is composed of quotations from various portions of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* strung together without sense or connection. Cf. Tertullian, *de Praesc.* 7.

its place. Of this Neander remarks[1]: "It is a profound idea of the Valentinian system that as all existence has its ground in the self-limitation of the Bythos, so the existence of all created beings depends on *limitation.* So long as each remains within the limits of its own individuality, and is that which it should be at its own proper position in the evolution of life, all things are fitly adjusted to each other, and the true harmony is preserved in the series of vital development."

Horos, the boundary, is also called Redeemer and Saviour in this system. It is also the cross separating, and is described in the text: "I am not come to bring peace on the earth, but the sword." "The fan in the hand" referred to the cross, which consumes all material things. But the cross supporting and sustaining is alluded to in the passage: "No man can be my disciple unless he takes up his cross and follows me[2]." This wresting of Scripture from its intended sense, condemned by Irenaeus, also appears in the writings of Christian Science. A yet more fanciful interpretation of the cross is found in the symbology of the Theosophist, according to which, "the fourfold cross (i.e. the Svastika) is the glyph for the square which represents the four lower planes of consciousness. On our three-dimensional planes the square becomes the cube, and the cube unfolded again displays the cross. The two numbers counted separately give us three and four—or, together, seven—that is an incarnated Christ, Whose descent into matter is called, exoterically, His Crucifixion[3]."

[1] *Church History*, II. 73.

[2] I. 3. 4, where he shows the distinction between the two operations ἡ ἑδραστική or *confirmation*, and ἡ μεριστική or *separation*.

[3] See W. F. Cobb's article in *Guardian*, Nov. 28, 1900.

The services of Horos were soon requisitioned, for Sophia, the last of the aeons, in her eagerness to see the light of the Supreme God, which could only be seen with safety by the First Mystery, stepped out of the Pleroma into the "void," and had to be brought back by Horos, but her child, Achamoth, was not allowed to enter. To guard against the recurrence of such a mishap, two new aeons, Christ and the Holy Spirit, were added by Nous or Intelligence.

The aeon Christ taught the others to rest content with the knowledge that Bythos was unknowable, and the Holy Spirit made them unite in glorifying this great Being. In gratitude for the restoration of harmony, each of the thirty aeons contributed something to the formation of another aeon, called Jesus, or Soter, who was the flower of the Pleroma. "For in Him dwelleth all the fulness or Pleroma of the Godhead[1]."

Thus the Valentinians based their scheme upon a text of Scripture which figures prominently in the comparatively modern system of Swedenborg. According to the teaching of the "New Church," this verse is the key to the mystery of the Holy Trinity: "For the fullness of the Godhead dwells bodily in the glorified humanity of Jesus Christ, the Father being the Divine Soul, the Son the Divine Body, and the Holy Spirit the Divine Sphere which proceeds from the Father, and which through the Divine humanity of the Son is accommodated to all the spiritual wants of men and angels[2]."

From the wanderings of Sophia outside the Pleroma the world and mankind originated. For the fall of the

[1] Coloss. ii. 9; Iren. I. 3. 4.

[2] Paper by R. L. Tafel, *Great Thoughts*, vol. XVII. p. 453. See also *True Christian Religion*, 167 et sq.

errant aeon into matter resulted in the quickening of a shapeless thing called Achamoth[1], which was shut out into outer darkness. Christ pitied her struggles, and touched her with His Cross, and she became the soul of the world, receiving from Him the form of being, though not of knowledge. From the struggles of Achamoth to reach the light were produced psychic existences, the Demiurge among them. And from her grief and tears at failure came material things, among them, Satan and his angels. But Achamoth turned again to supplicate Christ, Who, loath to leave the Pleroma a second time, sent her the Paraclete, or the Saviour, with a host of angels, the Father giving all things into His hands. Jesus gives her shape, which is according to knowledge, and from their union proceeds spiritual or pneumatic existence[2]. In this way the universe and man were created. Redemption consists in the deliverance of the spark of life or light from matter. The principal means of purification were a series of mysteries among which Baptism and the Eucharist had the first place, and also ascetic practices and a form of self-renunciation, which we find in the *Pistis Sophia*.

The immediate work of the creation of the world and man was performed by the Demiurge, who, by one school —the Alexandrians—was regarded as the unconscious instrument of the Father, but by another—the Syrian Gnostics—as the inveterate foe of the Supreme God.

[1] From the Hebrew חָכְמוֹת (kochmoth), plural of חָכְמָה, wisdom, the second of the Cabbalistic Sephiroth. This is often called "Mater," e.g. III. 25. 5, "matrem plorantem et lamentantem." Cf. Abel Remusat, *Mélanges Asiatiques*, I. p. 54, where Lao-Tseu's teaching is given, "Before the chaos which preceded the becoming of the heaven and the earth, a solitary Being existed, immense and silent. It was the *mother* of the Universe."

[2] I. 4. 5.

All Gnostics, however, regarded him, and not the principal God, as the creator of the world. The names under which he appears are as mysterious as the accounts of his origin are perplexing. He is described by Irenaeus as the "offspring of ignorance," and the "fruit of a defect[1]." Inferior to the Supreme God, the Propator or Bythos, but superior to the existing matter, a third and independent principle (ὕλη), the corporeal elements of which sprang from the bewilderment of Achamoth, he fashions the latter into shape, leading it from chaos into cosmos. He belongs to the middle class, the psychical, and consequently is ignorant of the Spiritual Being who is above him. By separating the psychical from the material he makes seven heavens, each of which is under the control of an angel. He then makes man, bestowing upon him a psychic soul and body. Achamoth, however, succeeded in imparting to man a spiritual germ or spark. Envious of the superiority of his own workmanship to himself, the Demiurge thrust man down to the earth. In the course of time he instructed the Jewish prophets to proclaim him as the Yahveh. But by reason of the spiritual germ, they also uttered prophecies inspired by a higher source than he[2]. He also created a Messiah, of a psychic soul and immaterial body, to which was added a pneumatic soul from a higher source. This lower Christ was born of the Virgin Mary, passing through her as water through a tube, and in his thirtieth year—a year that corresponded with the number of aeons—the aeon Jesus descended upon Him at His Baptism. To Him the Demiurge, on learning His mission, gladly yielded, and, in the form of a centurion, said: "And I am a man

[1] I. 16. 3, and II. 28. 4.
[2] I. 7. 3.

under authority, having soldiers under me[1]." But it was not possible for the aeon Jesus to suffer. Therefore the aeon Jesus and the spiritual soul abandoned the lower Christ when he was brought before Pilate, but the psychic Christ suffered, in order that the mother might show him as a type of the higher Christ who was extended on Stauros, the Cross, and who gave Achamoth substantial form, for all these things are the types of higher things. This travesty of the Christian faith which has many points of similarity to Buddhism[2] is set forth in the first nine chapters of the treatise.

With regard to Soteriology, Valentinus admitted a certain redemption, but declared that while faith was necessary for the psychical class of man, and miracles were required to produce it, the spiritual class were above such helps, and were saved by knowledge only, being admitted to "the wisdom of the perfect," whereas there was no salvation for the material class[3]. "The psychical needs discipline through the senses. They say that the Saviour took the firstfruits of those He would save, from Achamoth assuming the spiritual, but from the Demiurge receiving the psychical Christ, and from the constitution (or dispensation) taking a psychical body which could be seen and touched. But there was nothing material in it, because matter could not be saved[4].

[1] 1. 7. 1 and 4.

[2] See *Christianity and Hinduism* (Rowland Williams), c. 1.

[3] 1. 6. 2. "The psychical class, that is, men who are confirmed by works and faith and have not perfect knowledge, are educated in psychical matters. They say that we of the Church belong to that class, and that in our case a good life is necessary to salvation. But they are completely saved not by their works but through the fact that they are spiritual by nature, and cannot see corruption, *no matter what things they do*" (κἂν ὁποίαις συγκαταγένωνται πράξεσι), a very dangerous doctrine revived in later times by various sects.

[4] 1. 6. 1.

And the consummation was, that finally all spiritual creatures would be restored to their original state, and, reaching the flower of their perfection, would be united with their angelic partners in the Pleroma; that the Demiurge was to leave his heaven for the middle region, where he would reign over the psychic righteous; that the aeon Jesus, the Bridegroom, was to be united with his Bride, Sophia or Achamoth; and that the world and all that was material would be consumed by the fire that lurks within it.

Irenaeus is horrified at Marcion's idea that when our Lord descended *ad inferos* He was greeted by Cain and others like him who were saved, whereas Abel, Enoch, Noah and all the just men and the patriarchs being suspicious of the Saviour did not run to meet Him and did not share in his salvation[1]. On the other hand, he himself held that the Lord descended to the places below the earth to proclaim His coming and the remission of sins to those who believe on Him[2]. There is no notion of penalty or shame connected with this descent, which was founded on 1 Peter iii. 19. The clause is not found in any of his creed-like statements and was introduced much later into the Roman creed.

The number *three* played an important part in Gnostic theology, cosmology and psychology. There are three elements in theosophy, matter, Demiurge and Bythus;

[1] I. 27. 3.

[2] IV. 27. 1, in ea quae sunt sub terra=τὰ καταχθόνια, cf. V. 31. 1, tribus diebus conversatus est ubi erant mortui, IV. 33. 12. V. 31. 2, "commoratus usque in tertiam diem *in inferioribus terrae*." In three places, III. 20. 4, IV. 33. 12, V. 31. 1, he quotes a verse with variations which he assigns to Isaiah, but which Justin Martyr ascribed to Jeremiah. It was to the effect that the Lord remembered His dead who slept, and descended to them to preach the Gospel of Salvation and to save them.

three episodes in the history of religion, Heathenism, Judaism, and Christianity; and three divisions of man, the earthly, the psychical, and the spiritual; and three sources of the Scriptures[1]. Adamantinus, in his account of the Marcionite Megethius, described these principles. The good principle was God, the Father of Christ, the second was the Demiurge, while the third was the Evil One[2]. The good principle rules the Christians; the Demiurge, or creating principle, the Jews; and the evil principle the Gentiles. In a fragment from the school of Bardesanes, quoted by Eusebius, we find the three classes described as bad, just and good. "They who do evil without having suffered evil are bad, they who return evil for evil are just, while they who never retaliate are good[3]." "The material class are numerous, the psychical are not so many, while the spiritual are few[4]." The heathen are the material, the Jews according to some, and the Church people according to others, are the psychical, and the Gnostic Christians are the spiritual.

Such is a brief summary of the Valentinian Gnosis as described by Irenaeus. The system had certain good points. It emphasized first the fact that all life has emanated from God and must return to Him; and secondly the fact that all life, owing to its contact with matter, requires redemption. But its weak point lay in

[1] IV. 35. 1. "The School of Valentinus and other Gnostics declare that certain passages of Scripture were spoken from the highest place; that others were delivered from the intermediate place, while many portions proceeded from the Creator of the world by whom the prophets were sent." The psychical class had to take the literal meaning, but the pneumatic or spiritual class might take what meaning they chose from the Scriptures.

[2] *de recta fide*, sect. 1, *τρεῖς ἀρχὰς, Θεὸν τὸν πατέρα Χριστοῦ ἀγαθὸν καὶ ἄλλον τὸν δημιουργὸν καὶ ἕτερον τὸν πονηρόν.*

[3] *Praepar. Evang.* VI. 10, 274 C.

[4] *Clem. exc. ex Theod.* 56.

its holding that man is saved not by works or by faith but by the knowledge of the Divine nature which he was supposed to possess. According to the *Pistis Sophia*, "Man must renounce the world, if he would be united with the First Mystery or Christ, Who has passed downward through many spheres to bring to man the sacrament of purification and Who says: 'I will give unto you the Sacrament of the Ineffable....And I Myself am that Sacrament...and whosoever receiveth that Sacrament, that man is I and I am he.'"

The system of Marcion is somewhat different. Valentinus' system is florid, that of Marcion is austere. He professed to be purely Christian in his views, borrowing nothing from Oriental theosophy or Greek philosophy. His scheme is, therefore, purer and more practical than the other. He protested against allegorical interpretation, Church tradition, and all that savoured of Judaism. But while Valentinus spared the Scriptures because he expounded them according to his allegorical method, chiefly the Gospel of St John[1], Marcion, like a modern advanced critic, openly employed a sword rather than a pen (*machaera non stilo usus est*[2]), making selections from the Pauline Epistles to suit his own ideas. Holding, like the other Gnostics, three principles—the Supreme God, perfectly good; the Devil, a lord of matter, and the Demiurge, he described the latter somewhat differently. In his system the Demiurge is a judicial God[3], is separated by an infinite distance from

[1] III. 11. 7, hi autem qui a Valentino sunt, eo quod est secundum Johannem plenissime utentes ad ostensionem conjugationum suarum. In I. 8. 4—I. 9. 2 he shows how the prologue of the 4th Gospel was misused by this sect, which found its principles, God, Beginning, Word, Life, Man, Church, Truth, Only-Begotten, Grace, etc. there.

[2] Cf. *Tertullian de Praescript.* 38. See I. 27. 2.

[3] III. 25. 3. Cf. III. 12. 12.

the righteous God[1], and is the source of evils and the cause of strife. He is the author of the Old Testament, the inspirer of the prophets, and the Lord of all who belong to this world. The Jews are his favourite people, and his mission is to destroy heathenism and establish a Jewish empire. Then the Supreme God sent His Messiah, who accommodated himself to Messianic expectations, and proclaimed the Supreme God in an unreal body. But the Demiurge incited the Jews against him, and the Devil, or the Lord of matter, stirred up the Gentiles, and the Saviour was crucified. The difficulty of reconciling mercy with justice had turned Marcion against the Jewish system and Scriptures to such an extent that he kept the Jewish sabbath as a fast. Marcion's hatred of the Jews led him to reject everything, law, prophets, etc., connected with the Jews. He was also a vegetarian, and his strict views of total abstinence led him to forbid the use of wine in the Eucharist. But his scheme became the most popular of all, because of its professed asceticism, independence and practical rules, and the Marcionite communities were very strong in Egypt, Palestine, Persia, Arabia and Italy in the fourth century, doubtless owing to their courage in enduring martyrdom. Constantine (A.D. 330), however, forbade them to meet in their conventicles, and handed their churches to the Catholics. But they were not extinguished for centuries, and are said to have held their ground as a sect in Bosnia and Herzegovina down to 1774, and to have reappeared among the wilder elements of the German revolution. The Gnosis of Valentinus, on the other hand, had a more potent influence upon mystical minds, who were won by its

[1] I. 27. 2.

secrecy and pliability. Constantine's accession, however, pronounced, in a measure, its doom. A recent effort to revive its name and doctrines has been made in Paris, where there was until recently a small congregation, mainly recruited from Spiritualists, who professed faith in the doctrines of emanation and salvation by Gnosis only.

These heresies, however, are by no means defunct, and the arguments of Irenaeus are by no means obsolete. For the same ideas which he assailed are still germinating in human minds, and are constantly re-appearing in new forms. Even the casual reader must have been struck by the obvious resemblances that are to be found in Theosophy, Swedenborgianism, and Christian Science to ancient Gnosticism. Theosophy resembles Valentinian Gnosticism in the variety of its elements and the structure of its system. Its words are mysterious, only to be understood by the elect or the perfected. It alone has the exact and experimental knowledge of things. In its keeping are the secret doctrines revealed of old time by the Indian sages or Mahatmas, Jewish cabala and Gnostic teachers. And in its occult philosophy and esoteric teaching, science and religion are said to be combined. Professing to possess absolute truth, it describes the evolution of nature and of man. The universe evolves from primary substance, every material form being the crystallisation of the one pervading eternal life. Synthesis means life; disintegration is death. In nature there are seven kingdoms; three below the mineral, then the mineral, vegetable, animal, and human. Man evolves through a round of "seven globes[1] in a planetary chain," and through a series of

[1] Cf. the seven heavens of the Ophites presided over by their seven

re-incarnations or re-births. Seven "races" make a "round." Each individual must work through seven races on each planet before passing on to the next. Seven rounds have to be accomplished by our earth. Of these, four races of the fourth round have been finished. The ultimate goal is Nirvâna, or absolute absorption into the universal spirit, where there is an end of personal existence. This however is practically denied by modern Theosophists, who regard the *Ego* as but a reflection of the *Logos*. As of nature there are seven kingdoms, so of man there are seven parts. Of the organism which perishes there are four divisions—physical body, astral body, vitality, and animal soul. These four perish at death. Of the immortal, spiritual man there are three parts—mind, spiritual soul, and spirit. This last is formed by union of the spiritual soul with the universal spirit. For man is a spark of the universal spirit, prisoned in his body as a flame in the lamp. Few can boast of a human soul, but the spiritual soul is altogether undeveloped. This sevenfold classification is rejected in favour of a fourfold by later writers on Theosophy[1].

If we compare this philosophy of man and nature with the Valentinian, substituting the number three for the number seven in the case of man, the result is a number of correspondences. And when we take into account the part analogy plays in both, unrestrained by any logic or likeness, everything representing anything; the mystical values ascribed in each system to numbers; the identification of evil, Satan and matter; the typical

angels Ialdabaoth, Iao, Sabaoth, Adoneus, Eloeus, Oreus, Astaphaeus. *Adv. Haer.* I. 30. 5.

[1] Lectures on the *Bhagavad Gîtâ* by T. Sabba Row.

character ascribed to the triumph of Christ; the working out of man's salvation by transmigrations until perfection is reached, and the spark of life, purified and restored, is merged in deity; the superiority accorded to knowledge over faith, the gradual redemption of the higher parts of man from the material effects and influences and consequences[1]; the impersonal and pantheistic nature of the deity in both systems; the incorporation of the pneumatical man in the Pleroma of the Gnostics and the Buddhist's absorption into the universal spirit, we cannot fail to recognize in modern Theosophy a reappearance of many of the dreamy speculations of ancient Gnosticism. Moreover, both systems advocated a renunciation of all worldly desires and claimed to possess a secret which was not revealed save to the members. At the same time Theosophy, in its noble attempt to serve the cause of humanity and brotherhood, has borrowed from the social service principles of the religion of Christ, and sometimes parades its views in a Christian dress.

In the system of Emanuel Swedenborg there are also many points of contact with Gnosticism. The principle of correspondence between the spiritual and the natural, according to which the former produces, quickens and reveals itself in the latter, is not unlike the Gnostic principle of regarding everything in the lower region as symbolical of everything in the higher; e.g. the psychical Christ is represented as a type of the higher Christ. Compare the axiom of Theosophy, "As above so below." Their threefold principle of scriptural interpretation—the human, the spiritual, and the divine[2],

[1] These, both good and bad, are called *Karma*.

[2] Or the natural, spiritual and celestial senses (*Apoc. explained*, 1066). Origen (*Philocalia*, 1.) uses similar language, speaking of the visible "body"

—also finds its counterpart in the broad line of demarcation that separates the psychical from the spiritual sense, the literal meaning from "the wisdom of the perfect," in the Gnostic system. Attention has already been drawn to the fact that the same verse (Col. ii. 9) figures prominently in both systems. The claim of special revelation, private information, and the use of a prophetic style were characteristics of both movements. And while we cannot but admire the part allotted to good living, love, and charity in the system of Swedenborg, we cannot fail to remark a reproduction of much of the weird mysticism, ingenious exegesis and general mystification of ancient Gnosticism in the *Arcana Coelestia* and *Apocalypse Revealed* of Swedenborg.

In Christian Science we find another modern Gnostic rival of Christianity, if not as subtle as Theosophy, more attractive than Swedenborgianism, being arrayed in the garb of philosophical idealism, dogmatic optimism, and Christian Scripture. We are asked by it to believe that the world is a perfect world, that evil and matter do not exist, that sickness is a delusion to be overcome by persistent denials, and, as "flesh and blood cannot inherit the Kingdom of God," that God did not create them. The difficulty of reconciling the love and power of Deity with the existence of evil and the deficiency of justice, which the ancient Gnostics also essayed to remove, is severed, like another Gordian knot, by the Christian Scientists, but not settled. In Mrs Eddy's

of Scripture, the "soul" that is understood and the "spirit" which is according to the pattern of the things in the heavens. These are three stages of interpretation. Cf. Swedenborg, "The Word is like a Divine man: the literal sense is as it were his body, but the internal sense is as it were his soul: hence it is evident that the literal sense lives by means of the internal sense," *Arcana Coelestia*, 8943.

Key to the Scriptures we find many interpretations of the Gnostics. The object of Christian Science, as stated by one of its advocates (Lord Dunmore), is "to endeavour to get a spiritual insight into the knowledge of those laws and principles which relate to Christ and His teaching"; while that of Valentinus was to find support for his mystical speculations in the pages of Scripture. Both systems were put forward with pretentious claims to superior knowledge and enlightenment, and in a Scriptural form that might deceive even the very elect. The God of both Gnostic and Christian Scientist is impersonal, being Universal Mind in one, and Bythus in the other. The dual personality of Jesus is also asserted in both systems. For the Christian Scientists declare that the "man Jesus" suffered because He did not overcome the illusions of matter, while the Divine Idea, as Christ, could not suffer, and that the body of Jesus did not really endure death on the Cross. To cite the authoress's own words: "The invisible Christ was incorporeal, whereas Jesus was a corporeal bodily existence. This *dual personality* of the unseen and the seen, the spiritual and the material, the Christ and Jesus, continued until the Master's Ascension, when the human corporeal concept, or Jesus, disappeared." This distinction is based, whether consciously or unconsciously, upon the Gnostic division of the aeon Jesus and the "nether" Christ. The process of redemption is also similar in both systems. "In order to cure his patient," writes Lord Dunmore, "the metaphysician should first cast moral evils out of himself....A man...has to go through a course of self-purification before he can attain that spiritual freedom which will enable him to cope with the sufferings of his fellow creatures." This course

of self-purification, however, is not redemption in the Christian sense. "For man needs no redemption," says Mrs Eddy. It seems to be merely enlightenment. And this corresponds with the salvation by Gnosis or knowledge[1] only in the Gnostic system. Of course many fundamental differences are to be expected between a system of modern idealism in a Christian dress and a mosaic of speculation, in which Christian language was employed to express the esoteric doctrines of Persians, Indians, Jews, and Egyptians. One such difference is to be found in this, that the Gnostic believed in a general purification of the spiritual soul, but the Christian Scientist holds that man is already perfect. "God is the principle of man," writes Mrs Eddy, "and the principle of man remaining perfect, its idea or reflection, man, remains perfect." A certain nominal redemption was acknowledged by the Gnostics, but, according to the Christian Scientists, no redemption is needed. Evil was recognized by the Gnostics, but "evil is not," saith the Christian Scientist. Sin is not a falling back, but a step onwards in the evolution of the race. Suffice it to say that there is very little Christian except the texts, which are wrongly employed in this system, which, as has been demonstrated by many, has as little claim to the name of "science" as it has to that of "Christian," and is a real menace to true faith in God and prayer, because of the attractiveness which novelties ever have had for easily excited minds. It is a remarkable thing that women are now taking as prominent a part in the promulgation of this heresy as they did in the days of Tertullian (A.D. 180 circ.), who wrote in his *De Praescriptionibus*: "How forward are the heretic women, who

[1] I. 21. 4.

dare forsooth to teach, to argue, to exorcise spirits, to promise cures and perchance to baptize[1]." Irenaeus would describe all such revivers of ancient Gnosticism in one comprehensive saying: "omnes falso scientiae nomine inflati, Scripturas quidem confitentur, interpretationes vero convertunt[2]."

[1] c. 41, omnes tument, omnes scientiam pollicentur. ipsae mulieres haereticae quam procaces, quae audeant docere, contendere, exorcismos agere, curationes repromittere, forsitan et tingere.

[2] III. 12. 12.

CHAPTER XIX

CREED AND CONCLUSION

THE following creed[1], of an Eastern and Greek type as distinguished from the Roman and Western, might be drawn up from the Treatise of Irenaeus :

[1] The following are the passages in the text on which the foregoing creed is constructed :

Solus hic Deus invenitur qui omnia fecit, solus omnipotens condens et faciens omnia et visibilia et invisibilia et cælestia et terrena (II. 30. 9); unus et idem Pater (V. 16. 1); unus Deus Pater (IV. 6. 7); fabricator cæli et terræ (IV. 6. 4).

Verbum Unigenitus ipse est Iesus Christus Dominus noster (III. 16. 6); Μονογενής (I. 9. 3); blasphemant in Dominum nostrum, abscidentes et dividentes Iesum a Christo et Christum a Salvatore, et Salvatorem a Verbo, et Verbum ab Unigenito (*Praef.* IV.); unum Verbum, Filius (IV. 6. 7); Filius Dei (III. 10. 1); Progenies ejus, Primogenitus Verbum (V. 36. 3); ipse Unigenitus a Patre (III. 16. 9); Pater qui generaverit Filium (IV. 6. 6); visibile autem Patris Filius (IV. 6. 6); qui est ante omnem conditionem (V. 1. 1); semper autem coexistens Filius Patri (II. 30. 9 and II. 25. 3); cum Verbo suo juste dicatur Deus et Dominus solus (III. 8. 3); Christus cum Patre vivorum est Deus (IV. 5. 2); Lumen hominum (III. 16. 4); vere Deus (IV. 6. 7); per quem facta sunt omnia (III. 8. 2); et hunc incarnatum esse pro salute nostra (III. 16. 2); Ipse est qui descendit... propter salutem hominum (III. 6. 2); ex Virgine natum Filium Dei... ex Mariâ sit natus (III. 16. 2); Spiritus Sanctus advenit in Mariam...quod generatum est sanctum est, et Filius Altissimi Dei Patris omnium qui operatus est incarnationem ejus (V. 1. 3); hominis filius factus (III. 16. 3); homo verus (V. 1. 1); de semine David (III. 16. 3; cf. Ignatius, *ad Trall.* IX. ἐκ γένους Δαβίδ); crucifixi sub Pontio Pilato (II. 32. 4); passus sub Pontio Pilato (III. 4. 2); qui passus est pro nobis et surrexit propter nos et rursus venturus in gloria Patris ad resuscitandam universam carnem et ad ostensionem salutis et regulam justi judicii ostendere omnibus (III. 16. 6); et de cælis in gloria Patris adventum (I. 10. 1); descendit ad inferiora terrae (IV. 22. 1); et ascendit propter salutem hominum (III. 6. 1); assumptus est in cælos (III. 16. 9); resurrexit a mortuis, qui est in dexterâ Patris (III. 16. 9); qui destruet temporalia regna et aeternum induet (V. 26. 2).

Spiritus unus (IV. 6. 7); Spiritus Sanctus (V. *Praef.*); Spiritus vitae

"We believe in one God, the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth, and of all things visible and invisible.

"And in one Lord Jesus Christ, the Only-Begotten Word, the Son of God, the Offspring of the Father, the Visible of the Father, Begotten before all worlds, the Son Who is always co-existent with the Father, Who with the Father is the only Lord and God, Who with the Father is the God of the living, the Light of men and Very God, by Whom all things were made, Who descended for the salvation of men, Who became incarnate for our salvation, by the Holy Ghost, of the Virgin Mary, of the seed of David, and was made man, and was crucified under Pontius Pilate. He suffered for us; descended into the lower regions of the earth, rose again from the dead and ascended for the salvation of man; was taken up into heaven, and is at the right hand of God, and shall come again in the glory of the Father to raise all flesh and judge all men; Whose kingdom is eternal.

"And in one Holy Spirit, the Spirit of Life, the Spirit

(III. 2. 8); arrha incorruptelae (III. 24. 1); *πνεῦμα ζωοποιοῦν* (V. 12. 2); Domino effundente Spiritum Patris (V. 1. 1); adest enim ei (Patri) semper Verbum et Sapientia, Filius et Spiritus, per quos et in quibus omnia libere et sponte fecit (IV. 20. 1); Spiritu quidem operante, Filio vero ministrante, Patre vero comprobante, homine vero consummato ad salutem (IV. 20. 6); *per omnia unus Deus Pater et unum Verbum, Filius et unus Spiritus* (IV. 6. 7); per Spiritum imaginem et inscriptionem Patris accipiente (III. 17. 3); Filius et Spiritus Sanctus quibus serviunt et subjecti sunt omnes Angeli (IV. 7. 4); qui in prophetis quidem praeconavit (III. 21. 4).

Unitas ecclesiae (IV. 33. 7); hanc fidem ecclesia et quidem in universum mundum disseminata diligenter custodit quasi unam domum inhabitans (I. 10. 2); antiquus ecclesiae status in universo mundo et character corporis Christi secundum successiones Episcoporum (IV. 38. 8); quibus apostoli tradiderunt ecclesias (V. 20. 1); sancta (IV. 26. 5); catholica (III. 11. 8 where the Church's relation to the four catholic spirits and covenants is discussed); per lavacrum regenerationem restituens (V. 15. 3); *βάπτισμα ἀφέσεως ἁμαρτιῶν*; *βαπτίσματος τῆς εἰς θεὸν ἀναγεννήσεως* (I. 21. 2); Filius hominis factus a Patre potestatem remissionis peccatorum accipiens (V. 17. 3); cum sanctis Angelis conversationem et communionem (V. 35. 1); resurrectio quae est a mortuis (III. 20. 2 carnis, II. 33. 5); vitam...incorruptibilitatem ...gloriam sempiternam (I. 10. 1).

of the Father given by the Son, Who with the Son assisted in the Father's Creation, Who with the Father and the Son assists in the salvation of men, through Whom men receive the image of the Father and the Son, Who with the Son is worshipped by the angels; Who spake by the prophets.

"And in one holy, Catholic, ancient and apostolic Church, the baptism of regeneration for the remission of sins, the communion with the holy angels, the resurrection from the dead and the life everlasting."

There are many expressions in this creed thus reconstructed[1] which were afterwards embodied in the Nicene. Of these we may note a few. The *oneness* of the Father, and the *oneness* of the Son, are emphasized in both. The Father is also in both the Maker of all things *visible and invisible* by His Word the Only-Begotten. Jesus is Verus Deus (Irenaeus), Θεὸν ἀληθινόν (Nicene). He is the Lumen hominum (Irenaeus), Φῶς ἐκ Φωτός (Nicene). Cf. Si autem, velut a lumine lumina accensa, sunt Aeones a Logo. In both He is begotten of the Father before all worlds. In both He became incarnate for our salvation, pro salute nostra (Iren.), διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν (Nic.). In both He will return *with glory*, venturus in gloria patris (Iren.), ἐρχόμενον μετὰ δόξης (Nic.). In both the Holy Spirit is the Giver of life (ζωοποιοῦν), and spake by the prophets, qui in prophetis praeconavit (Iren.), τὸ λαλῆσαν διὰ τῶν προφητῶν (Nic.). Baptism is in both connected with the Remission of Sins. Attention has already been drawn to the fact that the word ὁμοούσιος, which figures so prominently in the Nicene Creed, was frequently used by Irenaeus, e.g. 1. 5. 4, where is given

[1] See *Hermathena* 1906; *Creeds of SS. Irenaeus and Patrick*, by the present writer.

the Gnostic account of the Creation of man, like, but not of the same substance, with God (*παραπλήσιος ἀλλ' οὐχ ὁμοούσιος τῷ θεῷ*). Cf. *δύναμις ὁμοούσιος* I. 11. 3 and "utrum ejusdem substantiae (= *ὁμοούσιοι*) existebant his qui se emiserunt an ex altera quadam substantia substantiam habentes?" II. 17. 2; *ὁμοούσιον ὑπάρχον τῇ μητρί, πνευματικόν*, I. 5. 5. The last passage shows that the word was capable of a non-materialistic meaning. It is also to be noticed that Irenaeus describes the Son as receiving the Spirit as a gift from the Father and giving Him to men (III. 17. 2), and shedding abroad the Spirit of the Father for the union and communion of God and man, V. 1. 1; expressions which assert both the Monarchia of the Father and the Double Procession of the Spirit, and therefore might form a basis for a mutual understanding between the Anglican and the Greek Churches.

Conclusion.

In concluding this sketch of the life and writings of Irenaeus we must notice in the first place how appropriately Irenaeus was named "the man of peace." For he ever strove for unity in the Church and uniformity in doctrine and organization; and his mind and temper were of the sort that reconciles. He had not the same spiritual depth and fervour as St Paul, and, therefore, did not feel the power of the Divine forgiveness in the same way. He did not express the same intensely passionate convictions as St Augustine, but he did not pass through the same experience; moreover, as a Greek, he was more inclined to treat sin from an intellectual rather than from an emotional standpoint. We miss in him the dogmatic precision of Tertullian, the ample scholarship

and classical culture of Clement of Alexandria and the scientific theology of Origen, yet his doctrine, founded upon the New Testament—the book he knew best—proved a more decisive factor than all three in the moulding of the historic faith. And, had he enjoyed the "learned leisure" of the great Alexandrian, he would doubtless have produced a greater work than the treatise.

His was not a creative genius, which could start a new line of thought or discover a new principle of development. He had many teachers, whose superiority he is always ready to acknowledge, and he learned their lessons well. But his keen wit, ready brain, and natural bent for argument, enabled him to utilize all his resources in his controversy, and to strike home when he struck; while his well-balanced temper and sympathetic nature kept him from extremes and helped him to conciliate without compromise. His style is equally well balanced, epigrammatic and lucid. He was a master of climax.

While the central thoughts of his Christology became the basis of future theological works, his scattered notes furnish us with many an important clue to the study of Church history. Taking a leading part in the great debates of the day concerning the attitude of the Church to the Gnostics, Montanists, the Canon of Scripture, the keeping of Easter, and the Episcopate, he is a true mirror of his age, its problems and activities. And his work gives us a photograph, blurred but invaluable, of the Church as it emerged out of comparative obscurity into the full light of day. In his time the leaders of the Christian Churches were beginning to examine the documents of the faith, under compulsion of the Gnostic critics, to apply the principles of Christianity to the problems of the age, to systematize the evidences of the

faith, and to emphasize the unity of the charter, faith and worship of the Church.

The part Irenaeus played in this work was important but hard to define. In his writings, however, we are able to trace the development of the Creed or apostolic faith, the growth of the Canon or apostolic documents, and the progress of the Church or the apostolic constitution. His literary work was, therefore, calculated not merely to discourage the enemies of the Church, but also to inspire men with loyalty to the Christian organization and history, the Scriptures and the Sacraments.

One of the best types of the Catholic Christianity which was becoming the chief religious influence of his day, he was also the representative to his own generation of the theological mind and practical purpose of St Paul, his love of religious order and spiritual liberty, as well as of his reverence for the truth of the Scriptures and the knowledge of God, and of his strenuous life. And he finds his representatives in the bosom of that Church which is at once Catholic and Evangelistic, inseparable from the past but adaptable to the present, modern yet historic. In the deep fervour, sweet reasonableness, subdued piety and well-balanced zeal of divines like the philosophic Whichcote and the constitutional Hooker, we find the qualities of head and heart which distinguished the Bishop of Lyons and enabled him to accomplish his great work on the essence of Christianity. It is safe to prophesy that the Church universal will never let that treatise die which teaches her to maintain calm in controversy and peace within her borders, "to think clear, feel deep and bear fruit well[1]." Much of the treatise has been superseded.

[1] in sententia pura et fide sine hypocrisi, in spe firma, in dilectione ferventi (IV. 18. 3).

But more has present force. For ancient errors are ever reappearing in new forms. And when we have separated the transitory from the abiding, the dross from the pure ore, the gains are not small. From the traditions of the middle ages, from scholasticism and metaphysics, we are summoned back by Irenaeus to the early Church, with its simple majesty and its martyr spirit—back to the vision of a Christ of infinite power and infinite pity. Personal sanctity is enhanced by communion with one whose life was lived in the light of the Word, the philosophy of history is illumined by the scroll that speaks of progress and the past, and our grasp of Jesus grows more firm as we clasp the hand of him who points us triumphantly through the long, long distances :

> On to the bound of the waste,
> On to the city of God.

EXCURSUS

THE LATIN TRANSLATION

It is a matter of dispute to what century this translation belongs. Westcott and Hort regard it as a 4th century work. But some authorities assign it to the end of the second. R. A. Lipsius in *The Dictionary of Christian Biography* says the Latin version "must have been made from the Greek original very soon after its composition, since the Latin text was used by Tertullian some ten years afterwards in his *Tractatus adv. Valentinianos*. Its author was a Celt (so we conclude from the barbarous Latinity), and probably one of the clergy of Lyons." Zahn in Herzog's *Real-Encyklopädie*, however, says the age of the translation "needs renewed investigation. For the opinion of Grabe and Massuet that Tertullian already used it *c. Valentinianos* is disputable." It is interesting to note that Tertullian in c. v. of that work alluded to Irenaeus as "a most eager explorer of all doctrines[1]." Massuet says, "there are some who believe that Irenaeus himself first wrote in Greek and then translated it into Latin. But such have little regard for his credit. For he would at least have followed the sense. It was probably some Greek person little versed in the Latin tongue who made bad Latin out of good Greek, and put a wrong construction upon his author more than once. Whoever it was, it is certain that the version is most ancient and was published either during the life or shortly after the death of Irenaeus." The reasons

[1] nec undique dicemur ipsi nobis finxisse materias, quas tot jam viri, sanctitate et praestantia insignes, nec solum nostri antecessores, sed ipsorum Haeresiarcharum contemporales instructissimis voluminibus et prodiderunt et retuderunt ut Justinus philosophus et martyr, ut Miltiades Ecclesiarum Sophista, ut Irenaeus *omnium doctrinarum curiosissimus explorator*, ut Proculus, etc.

given for this opinion are (1) the resemblances between it and the Latin of Tertullian's treatise, especially between the passages of the treatise (I. 2. 3) beginning "ante omnes Proarche" and that in Tertullian beginning "ante omnia Proarche" (c. 37), and (2) the mistakes common to both works, which originated with the translator of Irenaeus, for where he made a slip Tertullian followed suit. Both writers mistook the name Ἐπιφανής for an adjective (*clarus*, Iren., *insignior*, Tert.); both failed to understand σὺν τῷ ἐπιγιγνομένῳ πάθει (cum appendice passione, Iren.; appendicem passionem, Tert.); and both rendered ἀποσταυρωθῆναι which means "vallo cingi" by *crucifixam*. Again Loofs' view mentioned in Chapter III. and based on the arguments of the different books, and the antiquity of the Latin, which he assigns to a hypothetical original of about 200 A.D., carries weight. That antiquity is proved also by the mistranslation of εὐχαριστεῖν in I. 13. 2, ποτήρια εὐχαριστεῖν (to consecrate) by *pro calice gratias agere*, the avoidance or ignorance of the technical term being proof of an early date.

In many points, e.g. in creed-like expressions[1], biblical quotations, and style, we notice the influence of the Latin Irenaeus upon the *Confession* and the Epistle of St Patrick, who was trained in Gaul (circ. 411—432 A.D.). The translation would seem to have been established there a considerable time owing to the gradual disuse of Greek, and to have been one of the treasures of the island monastery of Lérins. We shall now consider the character of its Latin style and of its biblical quotations:

[1] See *Hermathena* XXXI. (1907, pp. 168—182), *Creeds of SS. Irenaeus and Patrick*, by the present writer. The influence of the treatise is also seen in the *Commonitorium* of Orientus, Bishop of Auch (circ. 410—450) in the South of France, and in the writings of the school of Lérins, e.g. the sermon of Hilary on Honoratus (430). Gennadius of Marseilles (c. 480) defined the incarnation after *Adv. Haer.* III. 19. 1 as "Dei filius factus est hominis filius" (*De eccl. dogm.*).

I. Literary and Grammatical Peculiarities in the Latin of Irenaeus.

(I) (α) Alliteration and (β) Assonance are constant features:

(α) e.g. corda carnalia capacia, v. 13. 3; perseverare ac permanere, IV. 14. 1; perdiderint panem vitae verae, II. 11. 1; Spiritu sanctitatis stolam, III. 23. 5; propria proferentes pessimis panniculis, II. 14. 1; superiora allevatitium arreptum statim, I. 30. 2; sermonibus vacuis et verbis scurrilibus, IV. 28. 1; perpessus ignorantiam substituit substantiam informem peperit, II. 20. 3, etc. This is also a feature of the Latinity of St Patrick[1].

(β) e.g. si prohibuisset nil profecisset, II. 30. 7; purus pure puram aperiens vulvam, IV. 33. 11; efficiet et perficiet, IV. 33. 11; lividum et invidum, V. 4. 1: pinguius et pigrius, I. 30. 8, etc. This is also a feature of the Latinity of St Patrick[2].

(II) The figure Chiasmus occurs frequently:

e.g. derident doctrinam eorum illorum autem misereantur, I. 31. 3; terrenum spiritali et spiritali terrenum, II. 19. 4; quod cogitat hoc et loquitur, et quod loquitur hoc et cogitat, II, 28. 5; Dei violaverit violabit eum Deus, IV. 8. 3, etc. This also is a feature of the Latinity of St Patrick[3].

(III) Doublets are frequently found:

e.g. plorans et plangens, I. 14. 8; fiducialiter et instantissime, *Praef.* III.; juste et legitime, V. 24. 2; hortatur et

[1] e.g. plorat et plangit (after I. 14. 8 plorans et plangens), *Epistola* 15; omnes omnino (after V. 12. 5), *Confessio* 8; sicut Spiritus suggerebat (after secundum id quod Spiritus suggerebat, IV. 38. 4), *C.* 48; promiserat per prophetas (after *per prophetas promiserat*, III. 9. 3 etc.), *C.* 38; inquisivi eum et ibi inveni illam, *C.* 33.

[2] e.g. adlevavit et collocavit, *C.* 12; cum timore et tremore, *C.* 8; paupertas et calamitas, *C.* 55; summam divinam sublimem potestatem, *Ep.* 6; vetantur...imitantur, *C.* 42; videtur corde creditur, *C.* 54; bene refecti et...repleti, *C.* 19; duobus mensibus eris cum illis, *C.* 21.

[3] sicut Spiritus gestit et animas et sensus monstrat affectus, *C.* 10; judicabunt nationes et regibus iniquis dominabuntur, *Ep.* 19; nec me poenitet nec satis est mihi, *C.* 53; satis Deo faciant et liberent servos Dei, *Ep.* 7; nesciunt miseri venenum letalem cibum porrigunt, *Ep.* 13, (notice metre).

admonet, I. 17. 1; timuerunt et dilexerunt Deum, IV. 22. 2; resistens et repugnans, III. 1. 3; audacter et irreverenter, III. 23. 4; typice et temporaliter, IV. 27. 4; augmentum et incrementum, IV. 10. 2. See also Patrick[1].

(IV) Adverbs in -ter are frequent:

e.g. inapprehensibiliter, irrationabiliter, qualiter, spiritaliter, impudenter, fiducialiter (III. 15. 1), multiformiter, largiter, sensuabiliter, fraudulenter, etc. See also Patrick[2].

(V) Superlatives are frequent:

e.g. sublimissimam, potentissimae, minutissimam, eminentissimam, splendidissimis, magnificentissimam, periculosissimae, perfectissima. See also St Patrick's works[3].

(VI) Adjs. in -ilis are frequent:

e.g. docibiles Dei, ineloquibilis, inaccusabilia, indocibilis, consumptibilia, projectibilis, seductibilis, inscrutabilia, transibilis, mirabilia.

(VII) Diminutives are frequent:

e.g. oviculam, aniculam, signaculum, flosculum, adminiculum, pinnaculum, vermiculus, muliercula, particula, navicula, etc. See also St Patrick's works[4].

(VIII) A penchant for compound verbs with *con*, *de*, *e* or *ex*, *per*, *prae*, *re*, *sub*, etc.

(IX) Asyndeton is frequent:

e.g. carnalis, derelictus, imperfectus, V. 6. 1; homo verus visibilis, III. 20. 4; mors, corruptio, error, II. 20. 3; lapidem, pretiosum, electum, summum, angularem, honorificum, III. 21. 5; fidem, spem, dilectionem, IV. 12. 2; caput, pectus, venter,

[1] credentibus et timentibus Deum, *C.* 62; zelo Dei et veritatis Christi, *Ep.* 1 (after propter timorem erga Deum et zelum veritatis, V. 30. 2); ammonet et docet, *C.* 40; sponte et laetus, *C.* 32; bene et diligenter, *C.* 40.

[2] spiritaliter, *Ep.* 4; fiducialiter, *C.* 14; qualiter, *C.* 9, 35; impudenter, *Ep.* 15; veraciter, *C.* 13; inenarrabiliter, *C.* 4, etc.

[3] e.g. sceleratissimis, *Ep.* 19; indignissimorum pessimorumque, *Ep.* 15; fortissimum scriptum, *C.* 11; speciosissimi atque amantissimi, *Ep.* 16; verbis peritissimis, *C.* 24; amicissimo, *C.* 27, 33; rusticissimus, *C.* 1.

[4] e.g. mulierculas, *Ep.* 12; munuscula, *C.* 49; mamellas, *C.* 18; tegoriolum, *C.* 18; scriptula, *C.* 50; latrunculus, *Ep.* 12, etc.

femora, pedes, II. 24. 4; aquam, tenebras, abyssum, chaos, I. 30. 1. See also St Patrick[1].

(X) Desire for variety leads to alteration of words and phrases:

e.g. *aliud accipit vocabulum* becomes *aliud percipit verbum*, V. 10. 1; *in servitutem redigentes* becomes *in servitutem deductus*, IV. 30. 2; *putantes* becomes *arbitrantes*, IV. 31. 2; *et rursus in epistola ait*, III. 16. 8, *in eadem epistola clarius dicit*, III. 16. 9; *clarificetur inter gentes* becomes *glorificatur in gentibus*, IV. 17. 5; *fides, spes, et caritas*, II. 28. 3, *fidem, spem et dilectionem*, IV. 22. 2; *praeterit habitus hujus mundi* (1 Cor. vii. 31) III. 35. 2 becomes *figura transit mundi hujus*, III. 36. 1; *Jesu Christi* becomes *Christo Jesu*, I. 10. 1; *ager autem saeculum est* (Mt. xiii. 38) IV. 40. 2, *ager enim mundus est*, IV. 26. 1; *et caeteros quemadmodum se*, IV. 12. 2, *diligere proximum sicut seipsum*, IV. 12. 4; *sicut Graeco sermone exprimitur*, II. 21. 1, *secundum Graeci sermonis significantiam*, II. 21. 1; *remissio peccatorum... remissio delictorum*, IV. 27. 1; *Diabolus* becomes *Satanas* in V. 21 and V. 22[2]: *id est* becomes *hoc est*, II. 21. 1; *exivit* becomes *exiit* in II. 5. 2; *Johannes Baptisator*, IV. 4. 2, becomes *Baptista* in IV. 7. 1. To the same class belong the variations of ob and propter, debet and oportet, antequam and priusquam, nec and neque, coram and in conspectu, and the changes in the government of verbs, as, dominabatur nobis ...dominabatur nostri, V. 1. 1; misereatur omnium, III. 20. 2, universis misereatur, I. 10. 3; miseratus plasmati, V. 21. 3; miserans ejus, III. 23. 6, etc.

(XI) The inf. is used after facere, venire, prohibere, polliceor (with present inf.).

(XII) Frequent use of gerundive and gerund in place of ut with inf.[3]

[1] e.g. una benedicta Scotta genetiva nobilis pulcherrima adulta, *C.* 41; Romanorum Gallorum Christianorum, *Ep.* 14; patricida, fratricida, lupi, rapaces, devorantes plebem, *Ep.* 5; rusticus, profuga, indoctus, *C.* 12.

[2] So Patrick passes from Satanas *C.* 20 to Zabulus, *Ep.* 4.

[3] e.g. ad danda cibaria (Vg. ut det, Mt. xxiv. 45) IV. 26. 5; ad baptizandos hos (Vg. ut baptizentur, Acts x. 47) III. 12. 15; ad emundandam aream (Mt. iii. 12, Vg. permundabit) IV. 4. 3; cf. Patrick, caro

(XIII) Abl. for extension of time: serviens ei multis annis, IV. 30. 2. Gen. of age: quadraginta annorum nondum es, II. 22. 6[1].

(XIV) Acc. after obliviscor and noceo[2] (nociti sunt, V. 5. 2).

(XV) Neuter of adj. for substantive: ad perfectum[3], IV. 39. 2, et al.; efficabile et principale et regale, III. 11. 8; suum inenarrabile, I. 14. 1, etc.

(XVI) Neuter of adjective as adverb[4]: humilia sentire, V. 22. 1; altum sentiunt, III. 25. 6; multum separata, V. 18. 1.

(XVII) Hebraisms, owing to influence of LXX., plus potuisse justitia ab (מִן) omnibus, I. 26. 1; pluris sit idiota religiosus a (מִן) blasphemo sophista, V. 20. 1; laetifici oculi ejus a vino (pulchriores vino, Vg.), Gen. xlix. 10, IV. 10. 2; maledictus tu *ab* omnibus pecoribus (Vg. *inter*) Gen. iii. 14, III. 23. 3.

(XVIII) Grecisms (principally literal translations of text), detegentur nihil recte dicentes, III. 11. 7; *latuit* semetipsum *incidens*, II. 33. 2; vestitum indumentum (Vg. veste), Matt. xxii. 11, IV. 36. 5; ridebis multum tantam stultitiam γελάσεις πολλά (I. 16. 3); capit (ἐνδέχεται), II. 13. 1; qui sumus ab ecclesia, οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς ἐκκλησίας, I. 6. 2; perfectorum perfectiores (gen. of comp.), I. 11. 5; exhomologesim faciens ἐξομολογούμενος, III. 4. 2; prurientibus aures (acc. of part), II. 21. 2; *a se* peccatum attulit, ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ, ultro, III. 23. 4; excidere a veritate, ἀστοχεῖν τῆς ἀληθείας, V. 3. 1; vivum perfecerit virum (tertiary predicate), V. 1. 3; perfectum effecit virum (do.) V. 1. 3; perfectos eos consummavit, II. 18. 1; et hoc (καὶ ταῦτα, and that too), II. 7. 7; bene habet, καλῶς ἔχει, *Praef.* IV.; desinimus diligentes, IV. 12. 2; manifestus eris

trahit ad illecebras perficiendas, *C.* 44; ad confirmandam fidem, *C.* 47; verba danda militibus, *Ep.* 2; dandus est ad gradum, *C.* 32.

[1] e.g. I. 3. 1, duodecim annorum Dominus existens, cf. *C.* 1, annorum eram tunc fere XVI; serviens ei annis multis, IV. 30. 2; tribus diebus conversatus est, V. 31. 1; tempore aliquo manens, V. 12. 2; cum quo fueram annis sex, *C.* 17; duobus mensibus eris cum illis, *C.* 21.

[2] Cf. caream sepulturam, *C.* 59; legationem fungor, *Ep.* 5.

[3] Cf. ad perfectum addiderunt, *C.* 9.

[4] Cf. Latinum exposui, *Ep.* 20; frequens orabam, *C.* 16.

projiciens, III. 14. 3; impossibilis est homo videre Deum (ἀδύνατός ἐστι), IV. 20. 8; non est (ἔστιν = ἔξεστιν) numerum dicere, V. 3. 2; aliquis (τις) frequently, e.g. virtus aliqua, II. 2. 3; quid faciens haereditaret, IV. 12. 4; incipiens ab (ἀρξάμενος ἀπό), I. 16. 1; obauditionem vult Deus quam sacrificia (θέλει ἤ), IV. 17. 1; vapulabit multas (Lk. xii. 47, multis Vg.) = δαρήσεται πολλάς, IV. 37. 3; habuimus salvari, III. 20. 3; habentes[1] ostendere, *Praef.* 1; habet videri = μέλλει ὁρᾶσθαι, IV. 38. 3. In addition to these Greek constructions there are a large number of Greek words simply transliterated, e.g. agogima, philtra, charitesia, theoremata, paredri, idolothyta, oneiropompi, pierga, palinodia, gazophylacium, prophetes, logion (λογεῖον breastplate of priest); aporiatam (ἀπορῆσαι), diastema, hyperbaton, myreadibus, romphaea, duodecastylum, etc.

II. Scriptural Citations.

I. These sometimes follow the LXX, differ frequently from the Vulgate and are in places followed by St Patrick:

e.g. Prov. i. 20, 21 runs so in V. 20. 1, Sophia in exitu canitur, in plateis autem fiducialiter agit, in summis muris praedicatur, in portis autem civitatis constanter loquitur.

This is after LXX ἐν ἐξόδοις ὑμνεῖται, etc. Vg. foris praedicat, in plateis dat vocem suam, in capite turbarum clamitat, in foribus portarum urbis profert verba sua.

1 Sam. xii. 3 is cited in IV. 26. 3 after the LXX, respondete mihi in conspectu Dei et in conspectu Christi ejus, cujus vestrum vitulum accepi aut asinum, aut super quem potentatus sum, aut quem oppressi, aut si de alicujus manu accepi propitiationem (ἐξίλασμα) vel *calceamentum* (ὑπόδημα), dicite adversus me et reddam vobis. The Vg., loquimini de me coram Domino, et coram Christo ejus, utrum bovem cujusquam tulerim aut asinum, si quempiam calumniatus sum, si

[1] Cf. baptismo quo ego habeo baptizari (Mk x. 38), I. 21. 2 (Vg. quo ego baptizvo). Cf. locutus sum ut *haberem* inde navigarem (that I might be able). Patrick, *Conf.* 18.

oppressi aliquem, si de manu cujusquam munus accepi, et *contemnam illud hodie* restituamque vobis.

The Latin Irenaeus reproduces the same mistranslation of the Hebrew which, as we have it, does not mean either *calceamentum* (shoe, so LXX) or *contemnam illud hodie*, Vg. but "I will veil or turn away mine eyes" (אַעְלִים). The LXX confuses this with נְעָלַיִם (Amos ii. 6), shoes.

Is. lx. 17 in IV. 26. 5, et dabo principes tuos in pace et episcopos tuos in justitia, is after LXX. (Vg. et ponam visitationem tuam pacem et praepositos tuos justitiam, after Hebrew.)

In the New Testament ἀπ' ἀρχῆς κόσμου of Mt. xxiv. 21 is rendered in v. 25. 2, ab initio saeculi. On this Mr Burkitt (*Texts and Studies*, IV. 3, p. 44) remarks that *mundus* and not *saeculum* is the rendering of κόσμος in the African text of the Synoptic Gospels, and that this "affords a striking instance of the 'European' character of Iren. Lat," but, in IV. 26. 1, Mt. xiii. 38 is rendered ager enim *mundus* est (in IV. 40. 2 ager autem saeculum est). Iren. IV. 2. 6 has salvator *mundi* in John iv. 42. So Vg., *mundus* being the European, and *saeculum* the African rendering of κόσμος in St John (Burkitt, l.c. p. 45).

There are many differences from the Vg. in the N.T., e.g. receptus est in caelum, II. 32. 3 and elsewhere, but Vg. has assumptus est in caelum (Acts i. 11). Cf. Patrick, *Conf.* 4, ad Patrem receptum.

In III. 16. 4, tunc adaperuit sensum (Lk. xxiv. 45) (Vg. aperuit); III. 12. 14, cognitum a seculo est Deo (Acts xv. 18), Vg. notum a saeculo, shows the penchant for compound verbs which is a striking feature of the Latin translation.

There are two versions of Mt. viii. 11. The first is influenced by Lk. xiii. 59, IV. 8. 1, quoniam venient ab Oriente et Occidente, *ab Aquilone et Austro* (Luke) et recumbent cum Abraham et Isaac et Jacob in regno caelorum. This reading is found in the Armagh MS. of St Patrick's *Confession* (39).

The second is, Multi ab Oriente et Occasu venient et recumbent cum Abraham et Isaac et Jacob in regno caelorum.

This is put in oratio obliqua in v. 30. 3 with Occidente for Occasu. The Vg. reads the former. It is remarkable that St Patrick has the same reading in *Ep.* 18.

In Mt. xii. 36 Lat. Irenaeus has, omnis sermo otiosus... reddent pro eo rationem, II. 19. 1, IV. 16. 4; but Vg. "verbum" and "de eo," cf. Orientius II. 311,

Quando etiam incauto si quid nunc ore loquaris
Sermonis ratio est discutienda tibi.

Rom. ix. 25 appears in a strange form in IV. 20. 12, fiat qui non populus, populus: et ea quae non est *misericordiam consecuta*, *misericordiam consecuta*; et in loco *liberata* in quo vocabatur non populus, etc. The Vg. runs, vocabo non plebem plebem meam; et non dilectam dilectam; et non misericordiam consecutam misericordiam consecutam; et erit in loco ubi dictum est, etc. In the N.T. Greek the "misericordiam" clause (of Hosea ii. 23) is absent; and in Irenaeus the "dilecta" clause of Vg. and Greek N.T. is wanting. Irenaeus may have been influenced by 1 Pet. ii. 10, which has the "misericordiam" clause of Hosea ii. 23 only. Patrick, *Conf.* 40, follows him.

The expression liberata or eliberata is perhaps, as Massuet suggests, due to confusion of ἐῤῥέθη, Rom. ix. 26 (Hos. i. 10), "in the place *where it was said*" with ἐῤῥύσθη, was delivered.

In I. 10. 3 we have ὁ οὐ λαὸς λαὸς, καὶ ἡ οὐκ ἠγαπημένη ἠγαπημένη, so Rom. ix. 25 (Greek). So *Apostolic Preaching*, c. 93, Ich werde zu Nichtmeinvolk sagen, mein Volk bist du, und die Nichtgeliebte wird geliebt sein. There are variations accordingly in the forms in which this text appears in the Latin Irenaeus, which are due to various causes. However his citations of Eph. iv. 6, a favourite text, all agree in omitting πάντων (omnium) after Father and καὶ after God, which are in Greek and Vg. So *Apost. Preaching*, c. 5, Ein Gott Vater, der da ist über allen; II. 2. 6, Unus Deus Pater qui super omnes; Unus Deus Pater...Unus Pater qui est super omnia; so IV. 20. 2.

In this Irenaeus is followed by St Patrick; *Ep.* 11, unum Deum Patrem habemus; *Ep.* 16, unum Deum Patrem habemus.

Phil. ii. 9—11 in I. 10. 1, omne genu curvet...et omnis lingua confiteatur ei. Ei is not in Vg. or Greek N.T. But Patrick, *Conf.* 4, has ei after Irenaeus.

Rev. 21. 4, et mors non erit *amplius* in v. 35. 2. Vg. mors *ultra* non erit. Patrick, *Ep.* 17, neque mors *amplius*. Amplius also in III. 12. 14 where Vg. of Acts xv. 28 has *ultra*.

II. Irenaeus' own quotations of the same passages show considerable divergence from each other, and generally one of each set is closer to the Vg. than the others.

Mt. xxiv. 21: (1) erit tunc pressura magna qualis non est facta ab initio saeculi usque nunc, sed neque fiet (v. 25. 2). (2) erit tribulatio qualis non est facta ab initio neque fiet (v. 29. 1). (3) erit terrae motus magnus qualis non est factus ab initio (IV. 33. 13). Vg. erit enim tunc tribulatio magna qualis non fuit ab initio mundi neque fiet.

1 Cor. vii. 31: figura transit mundi hujus, v. 36. 1; praeterit enim habitus hujus mundi, v. 35. 2. Vg. praeterit enim figura hujus mundi.

Eph. i. 21: super omne initium (ἀρχήν), IV. 19. 2; super omnem principalitatem, II. 30. 9; super omnem principatum, IV. 24. 2. Vg. principatum.

1 Pet. i. 8: quem non videntes diligitis, in quem nunc non videntes credidisti, gaudebitis gaudio inenarrabili, IV. 9. 2; quem cum non videritis diligitis, in quem nunc quoque non videntes creditis, credentes autem, exultabitis gaudio inenarrabili, v. 7. 2. So Vg. with laetitia for gaudio.

1 Pet. i. 12: in quae (εἰς ἃ) cupiunt angeli prospicere, II. 17. 9; quem concupiscunt angeli videre, v. 36. 3; in quem desiderant angeli prospicere, Vg.

2 Thess. i. 6 sq.: retribuere eis qui tribulant vos *tribulationem*; et vobis qui tribulamini *requiem*, IV. 33. 10; retribuere *retributionem...refrigerium*, IV. 27. 4. Vg. retribuere *tribulationem* iis qui...*requiem*.

Titus iii. 10: haereticum autem hominem *post unam* correptionem devita, III. 3. 4; *post primam et secundam*, I. 16. 3. So Vg.

The Greek text of III. 3. 4 (Euseb. *H.E.* IV. 14) has καὶ δευτέραν[1]. But compare haereticum post primam correptionem recusandum, Tert. *De Praes.* 6. So Cyprian, *ad Quir.* III. 78.

Mt. xix. 16: remitte mortuos sepelire mortuos, I. 8. 3; sinite enim mortuos..., v. 9. 1; sine ut mortui sepeliant mortuos (Vg.); ἄφες...θάψαι, cf. Vg.'s use of sinere, *sinite abire* (ἄφετε ὑπάγειν), John ii. 44; but *dimittite abire*, Iren. v. 13. 1.

Lk. ii. 29: gratias egit Deo et dixit, Nunc *remittis* servum tuum secundum sermonem tuum in pace, I. 8. 4; benedixit Deum et ait, Nunc *dimittis* servum tuum...in pace, IV. 7. 1, III. 10. 5; benedixit Deum et ait, Nunc *dimittis* servum tuum, Domine, secundum *verbum tuum* in pace, III. 16. 3 and Vg.

The Lat. Iren. favours remittere, e.g. III. 18. 5, Pater remitte eis (Vg. dimitte), Lk. xxiii. 34; III. 12. 3, remittere (Vg. dimitti) of Acts iii. 13.

John iv. 37: *sermo* est verus quoniam alter quidem est qui seminat, alter qui metet, IV. 25. 3; est *sermo* verus quoniam alius est qui seminat et alius qui metit, IV. 23. 1. So Vg. with *verbum* for sermo and *quia* for quoniam, both frequent in Lat. Iren.

John viii. 44: diabolus mendax et ab initio, v. 22. 2; ab initio homicida et..., v. 23. 2; ille homicida erat ab initio, Vg.

Acts viii. 32: quemadmodum ovis ad victimam ductus est, et quemadmodum agnus in conspectu tondentis...judicium ablatum, IV. 23. 2; tanquam ovis ad victimam (v. l. occisionem) ductus est, quemadmodum agnus ante tondentem se...nativitatem quis enarrabit, III. 12. 8; *ibid.*, ut ovem ad victimam ductum; IV. 33. 1, sicut ovis ad victimam adductus. Vg. tanquam ovis ad occisionem, et sicut agnus coram tondente se...judicium sublatum...generationem quis enarrabit.

Rom. xiii. 1: quae (potestates) sunt a Deo *dispositae* sunt, v. 24. 1; quae sunt potestates a Deo *ordinatae* sunt, IV. 36. 6. So Vg.

[1] Harvey suggests that *et alteram* may have been omitted to bring the passage into harmony with the old Italic version: it is more likely that the Greek was revised by Eusebius.

There are no less than four different versions of the passage which Justin Martyr accused the Jews of having removed from Jeremiah (*Cum Tryph.* 72), viz. III. 20. 4, et commemoratus est Dominus sanctus Israel mortuorum suorum qui dormierant in terra sepultionis; et descendit ad eos evangelisare salutem quae est ab eo ut salvaret eos. See also IV. 33. 12, IV. 22. 1, IV. 33. 1. In the first "Israel" only is found, and there are several other divergences in the four versions. This very fact is a significant index of the method of free quotation followed in the treatise. Mr Harvey's suggestion that a Syriac version of the treatise existed at one time has been supported by the discovery of an Armenian version of the tract on *Apostolic Preaching* which may have been rendered directly from the Syriac.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Editions of the Treatise by Massuet, Stieren, and Harvey, Articles in Herzog's *Real-Encyklopädie* and the *Dictionary of Christian Biography* by Zahn and Lipsius respectively; the second volume of the *History of Dogma* by Dr Harnack; his edition of the *Apostolic Preaching* and his critique of the Pfaff Fragments in *Texte und Untersuchungen*; Kunze's *Gotteslehre von Irenäus*; Werner's *Paulinismus des Irenäus*; Loofs' *Handschriften der Lateinischen Übersetzung* (1888); Heinrich Ziegler's *Bischof von Lyon* (1871), and *Lehre von der Autorität der Schrift*, etc. Lipsius, *Die Zeit des Irenäus*; Harnack, Gebhardt und Zahn, *Altchristliche Literatur* B. VI. (1889). The writings of Lightfoot and Westcott, Stewart Means' *Saint Paul and the Ante-Nicene Church*. Articles by Drs Rendel Harris and Conybeare in the *Expositor* (1907), on the *Apostolic Preaching*, and by the present writer on the *Creed* (1907), and *Apostolic Preaching* (1908) of Irenaeus, in *Hermathena*, and *Apostolic Preaching* (1907) in *Journal of Theological Studies*, etc., etc.

GENERAL INDEX

Acts, The, mentioned by Irenaeus, 220
Adam
  our organic union with, 162 et sq.
  disobedience of, 165
  salvation of, 165
  praevaricatio of, 175
Adon, Bishop, list of, 8
Adversus Haereses, treatise
  Harnack's appreciation of, 44
  titles of, 46
  Latin translation of, 347 et sq.
  Latin MSS. of, 46 et sq.
  quotations from, 50
Aeons, theory of, 41
Agrapha, the, used by Gnostics, 198
Alexander, martyr, 5
Altar, the heavenly, 273
Ambrose, Bishop, *De Mysteriis* of, 277
ἀνακεφαλαίωσις, 29, 131. See *recapitulatio*
Anatolius, 12
Anicetus, of Rome, 3, 7, 12, 252
Anselm
  a priori proof of, 100
  theory of satisfaction, 173
  influenced by Feudalism, 174
  on the death of Christ, 175
Anthropomorphism, protest against, 98
Antinomianism, 293
Apocalypse, the, 233, 310, etc.
Apocalyptic, 190
Apollinarian error, 134
Apologists, the Christian, 20, 27, 34, 36, 158
Apostasia, the, 168 et sq., 308
Apostolic Constitutions, the, 282
Apostolic Preaching, the, of Irenaeus
  described in c. XVII
  Dr Harnack on, 312 et sq.
  article in *Hermathena* on, 124
  see further 13, 114, 116, 120, 121
Arianism, 157
Arians, their views of the Logos, 143
ἀρραβών (arrha), the Holy Spirit as, 119, 153
Arundel manuscript, 48 et sq.
Athanasius
  on "the Hand" of God, 107
  on the Son, 111
  on the Word of God, 125, 154 et sq.
  on the mutilation of the Scriptures, 236
  on the Atonement, 177
  on the Divinity of Man, 168
  on the Divine consistency, 173
Athenagoras, 33
Attalus, martyr, 5
Atonement, the
  how connected with Incarnation, c. X
  mercy motive of, 176
  reconciliation as aspect of, 178
Augustine, of Hippo, 17
  quotes Irenaeus, 44, 147
  on Communion with God, 81
  on Predestination, 84
  On Original Sin, 44
  Confessions of, 103, 105
  on sin, 161
  on the Devil, 170 et sq.
  on prophecy, 187
  on the Old and New Testaments, 202, 207
  on the African use, 273
αὐτεξουσία, Justin's word, 30

Baptism, Holy, 264 et sq.
the grace of, 265
Gnostic forms of, 266 et sq.
Baptismal regeneration, 28, 266
Barnabas, letter of, 21
Baruch, *Apocalypse* of, 26
Basil, 19, 111
Basilides, Gnostic, 39
Besançon connected with Irenaeus, 10
Bezae, codex, 41
Biblical views of Irenaeus, c. XI
Bishops
succession of, 242, 251
relation of to presbyters, 256 et sq.
Blandina, martyr, 5
Blastus, letter to, 12
Böhringer, Dr, quoted, 161
Browning, Robert, 62, 143, 144
Butler, Bishop, *Analogy* of, 97
Bythos, the, of Gnostics, 91

Cabala, Jewish, 15
Cambridge, Platonists of, 34, 102
Canon, the, of the New Testament, c. XII
Harnack on the Canon of Irenaeus, 213
Catechism, the Anglican
questions on the Eucharist, 271 et sq.
compared with *Apostolic Preaching*, 326 et sq.
Catholic
the Church and heretics, 68
Epistles, the, 230 et sq.
Catholicity of the Church, 246
Charismata, 260
Charismatic ministry, 259 et sq.
Charity, eulogy of, 249
Chiasmus, figure of, in Latin translation, 155, 349
Chiliasm, 5, 42, 307
Christ
Socrates and, 27
Justin's views of, 33
the Blood of, 179
the humanity of, 154
suffering of, 159
man's organic union with, 160
sufferings of, real, 163
Gnostic views of, 133
revelation of (Ritschl), 148
Christian Science, 15, 38
compared with Gnosticism, 336 et sq.
Christianity and Judaism, 206
Christology, centre of Irenaeus' system, 128
Church, the
teaching and faith of, 68 et sq.
as teaching body, 192
teachers of, different from Gnostics, 71, 183
rule of truth of, 183
depository of the truth, 242
unity of faith of, 243
Apostolic descent of, 244
six points of union of, 245
catholicity of, 246
sanctity of, 247
testimony of, 247
unity of, 248
Sacraments of, c. XIV
notes of, c. XIII
Church, the late Dean, on the Episcopate, 263
Clement, of Alexandria
Stromateis of, quoted, 16, 21, 159
on the Gospels, 215
on the Testaments, 201, 207
use of *προφορικός*, 142
Clement, of Rome
on O.T. types, 186
use of Epistle to Hebrews, 230
Clermont, the MS., 48 et sq.
Commodus, reign of, 18, 45
Convenire, meaning of 252
Creation, various parts of, 88
Crescens, first bishop of Vienne, 8
Cyprian, 11, 44
Cyril, 17

Death
the Death of Christ, 175
a theme of Irenaeus, 161
a bloody death in the Economy of Incarnation, 179
Debt
the, to death, 163
and disobedience, 162
Decalogue, the, enjoins love of God, 56
Demiurge, the, of the Gnostics, 90, 193, 332

Denney, Dr, *Studies in Theology*, 135
Development, God-directed, 82
Dionysius of Alexandria, on the *Apocalypse*, 233
Dionysius the Areopagite, *Ecclesiastical Hierarchy* of, 269
Disobedience
and death, 162
mitigated by Christ, 181
Domitian, 2
Duchesne (L'Abbé), 4

Earnest, the, of Spirit (ἀρραβών), 153
Ebionites and Gospel of Matthew, 212
Eddy, Mrs Baker, 37, 197, 338
Education of man, c. IV
Egyptians
Gospel of, 212
Hebrews and, 189
ἔκκλησις (evocatio), Harnack on use of, 271
Eleutherus, of Rome, 5, 6, 45, 253
Ely, Bishop of, 233
Emanations, theory of, 36
ἐνδιάθετος, used by Philo of Logos, 142
England, connection of with I., 48
Epicureans, Gnostics compared with, 82
ἐπίκλησις (invocatio), 271
Epiphanes, error with regard to name, 43
Epiphanius, 39, 45, 227
Episcopate
Dean Church on, 263
the historic, 255 et sq.
ἐπίσκοπος, meaning of, 259
Erasmus, 16, 43, 231
Eucharist, the, 28
a daily, 273
Irenaeus' doctrine of, 270 et sq.
two realities of, 276
Justin's view of, 272
Tertullian's view of, 277
four steps in service, 278
Eusebius, 1, 5, 7, 10, 13, 16, 25, 31, 42, 45, 215, 229, 253
Eutyches, monophysitism of, 136
εὐχαριστεῖν, meaning of, 279
Eve
and Mary contrasted, 137
disobedience of, 147
Evolution, 82
Exodus, the, 189

Fall, the, teleological significance of, 59
Father
the omnipotent, c. VI et al.
Parent truth of theology, 78
Wisdom of, 86
the creator, 80
the Perfect One and invariable, 83
Architect of World, 83
revelation of, in Incarnation, 155
relation to Divine Son, 111
Monarchia of, 125
the Son "the visible" of, 133
Feuardent, 231
Florinus, letter on "the Ogdoad" to, 12
Foreknowledge and Predestinating Will of God, 83
Freedom of Will
man's, a test of character, 291
image of God as, 290
freedom of maintained by I., 85

Gallican
Christianity, 3 et sq.
churches, letters to, 7
Gnostic
teachers different from Church, 71
views on Christ, 133 et sq.
Soteriology, 328 et sq.
canons and exegesis, 234 et sq.
Gnosticism
Marcionite, 16 et sq., 331 et sq.
Valentinian, 16 et sq., 322 et sq.
ancient and modern, c. XVIII
"a motley Christianity" (Tertullian), 35
on suffering of Jesus, 163
appeal to tradition, 196
use of Scriptures, 197
cryptic allusions of, 240
division of men, 293
Irenaeus' controversy with, 197, et passim
Gnostics
the first theologians (Harnack), 36
on the knowledge of God, 98 et sq.

God
man's need of, 81
Will (creative, beneficent, purposeful) of, 83 et sq.
relation of justice to goodness of, 85 et sq.
divided by Marcion, 85
subjection to, immortality, 288
Irenaeus' view of, 86 et sq.
absolute causality of, 89
perfect knowledge of, 89
Tennyson on nature of, 90
Biblical names for, 193
image and likeness of, 287
personality of, 297
man's knowledge of, c. VII
Gnostics on, 98 et sq.
the name of, 99
immensa benignitas of, 101
unity of, 201
Godhead, the, the Divine Persons of, c. VIII
Gore, Bishop, on Transubstantiation, 277
Gospel
law and, 208 et sq.
privileges of, 210
four-formed (τετράμορφον), 215
of Peter, 215
advance beyond law, 57
Gospels, 215 et sq.
apocryphal, 215
harmonies of, 215
reasons for there being four, 216
Grabe, editor of Irenaeus, 49, 255
Gregory the Great, *Moralia* of, 170
Gregory (Nazianzen), 142
on the ransom-theory, 171
Gregory (of Nyssa), on devil as deceiver, 170
Gregory (Thaumaturgus), 132
Gregory (of Tours), 8, 10, 17

Hands of the Father, 125
Harnack, Prof., 23, 24, 29, 36, 40, 44, 67, 117
on Irenaeus' views of the Holy Spirit, 122
on Irenaeus' use of the Logos-idea, 128, 156
on Irenaeus' views of sin, 161
on I.'s theory of revelation, 200
Harnack, Prof.
on the *Apostolic Preaching*, 312 et sq.
on the Canon in Irenaeus, 213
on the Pfaff fragments, 281
on baptismal views of Irenaeus, 269
Harris, Prof. Rendel, 315
Harvey, editor of Irenaeus, 2, 49, 142, 149, 154, 223
Hatch, Dr, 259
Hebrews, Epistle to, 229
Hegesippus
Memoirs of, 31, 253
lost work of, 37
Hell, the clause "He descended into," 69
Hermas, *Pastor* of, 20
Hippolytus (of Portus), 7, 46, 50
Contra Noetum, 111, 123
Philosophumena, 168
Homer quoted, 43
Homoousion, the, 76, 139
Horace, echoes of, 43
Hort, Dr, on the *Apocalypse*, 238
Hosea, 188
Hyginus, Bishop of Rome, 252
Hypostatic Union, 149

Ignatius, 9, 22, 23
Epistles of, 22–23
language of, on Incarnation, 131
words ascribed to, 306
Immortality, subjection to God, 80
Incarnation, the
doctrine of, 28, c. IX
revelation of Father, one reason for, 155
and a bloody death, 179
and incorruption, 152
Irenaeus' formula for, 133
Ritschlian views on, 134
economy of, 179
Christian Apologists on, 158
Incorruption
and incarnation, 152
man made partaker of, 180
Inspiration
and private judgement, 193
St Paul's, 155
Interpretation
mystical, 21, 30, 183
Irenaeus' principle of, 31

Interpretation
  Origen's principle of, 186
Invocation of Holy Spirit, 270
Irenaeus
  and Pothinus, 7
  and Montanists, 6
  and Quartodecimans, 11
  and Marcion, 15
  and the Keltae, 16
  his letter to Victor, 12
  his letter to Florinus, 12
  his writing to Marcianus (*Apostolic Preaching*), 13
  the Pfaff fragments, 13, 281 et sq.
  martyrdom of, uncertain, 17
  teachers of, c. II
  Irish Church and Irenaeus, 77
  on revelation, 155, 181
  on the Atonement, c. X
  mystical interpretation of, 21
  his theology, Christ centre of, 23
  Polycarp's influence on, 24
  St Paul's influence on, 24, 221
  Papias' influence on, 25, 217, 310
  Justin Martyr's influence on, 27–29
  influence of certain presbyters on, 30
  and Marcus the heretic, 32
  treatise of, c. III et passim
  theology of, outcome of what?, 36
  as Scripture theologian, 40
  success of the treatise of, 40
  and the Gnostics, 41 et sq.
  rule of faith of, 41
  a Greek Father, 43
  Greek text of treatise of, 43
  Latin MSS. of treatise, 44 et sq.
  heresy of Montanus, 45
  Reformation studies in, 48
  creed of, 66, c. XIX
  on immortality, 154, 288
  his influence on St Patrick, 77
  on Marcion's views of God, 85
  his own view of God, 86 et sq.
  on practical problems, 89
  avoids speculative questions, 89
  on the Creator, 90 et sq.
  on the Supreme God of Gnostics, 94
  Johannine view of Logos, 127
  on redemption, 128
  on the Virgin, 136 et sq.
Irenaeus
  on the Virgin-birth, 144 et sq.
  doctrine of sin, 161
  on the suffering of Jesus, 164
  no idea of compensation, 171
  on the Death of Christ, 175
  on the Scriptures and their problems, c. XI
  on tradition, 196 et sq.
  controversy with Gnosticism, 197, 304
  early witness of the N.T., 214
  on the four Gospels, 216
  on St Mark's Gospel, 216
  use of Pauline Epistles, 221
  combined readings of, 225
  on schismatics, 248
  on charity, 249
  on the continuity and orders of the Ministry, c. XIV
  lectures Victor Bp of Rome, 252
  use of term *presbyter*, 255
  on the charismata of the Church, 260
  on Baptismal Regeneration, 266
  on the grace of Baptism, 269
  on the Eucharist, 270 et sq.
  psychology of, 283
  on the image and likeness of God, 296
  on the freewill of man, 292 et sq.
  on the salvation of man, 298 et sq.
  eschatology of, 307 et sq.
  creed of, reconstructed, c. XIX
  character of, 343 et sq.
Irenaeus, of Sirmium, 17
Irish
  Church, 77
  baptism, 269

Jerome, 13, 16, 17, 42
Jerusalem, Church of, 69, 273
Jesus, the "dispensational" of Gnostics, 134
Johannine conception of Logos, 127 et sq.
John, the Disciple, 26
  Gospel of, 217
  Revelation of, 232 et sq.
John, Presbyter, 25
Joseph, descent of, 146
Judaism and Christianity, 206

Judgement, private, and inspiration, 193
Justin Martyr, 5, 7, 27, 29, 30, 33, 116
Apology of, 27 et sq.
book *against Marcion*, 28
lost *syntagma* of, 37
one of his ideas, 122
on types, 186 et sq.
on "the president," 258
on Baptism, 265
on the Eucharist, 272

Kant, Antinomies of, 91
Keltae, the, 11, 16
Kenoma, the, of Gnostics, 94
Kenosis, the, views of, 143
κλῆρος, ὁ, whence *clergy*, 260
Kunze, criticism of Irenaeus, 141

Latham on the O. and N. Testaments, 206
Latin
translation of Treatise examined, 346 et sq.
age of do., 44
Laver, the, of regeneration, 265
Law, the Mosaic, 57, 208 et sq.
Leo the Great, on the debt to the devil, 171
Leonidas, the father of Origen, 102
Liddon on episcopacy, 255
Life, theme of Irenaeus, 161
Lightfoot, Bp, 2, 4
Logos
Johannine use of Logos-idea a compromise (Harnack), 128
Tertullian on, 127
see *Word*
Loofs, Dr, on Latin MSS. of the Treatise, 44, 46 et sq.
Lotze on the human personality, 296
Lugdunum (Lyon), 3, 16
Luke, St
Gospel of, 220
"we-sections of," in Acts, 220

Magnesians, Ignatius' letter to, 22 et sq.
Malachi, prophecy of, 272
Man
made for growth, 203
God the goal of his life, 204
tripartite division of, 283 et sq.
progress of, 310
Marcianus, *Apostolic Preaching* sent to, 315
Marcion, the Gnostic
his treatment of Scriptures, 211, 235
Canon of, 227
system of, 331
Marcionites
on the Creator, 84
on the God of Judaism, 85
Marcosians, Gnostic sect, 212
Marcus (Aurelius), 3
Marcus (Gnostic), 9, 32
Martyrologium Romanum, 17
Mary, the Virgin. See *Virgin*
Massilia, port of, 4
Massuet (editor of Irenaeus), 17, 47, 203, 235, 274
Matthew, Gospel of
used by Ebionites, 212
Irenaeus on, 216
Maximus (of Turin), 13
Means, Rev. Stewart, *St Paul and the Ante-Nicene Church*, 197, 208
Milan (Church), Baptism, 266
Ministry
the charismatic, 259
continuity and orders of, c. XIV
Montanist heresy, 4 et sq.
Irenaeus and, 6, 45
rejection of the Gospel of St John, 211
repudiation of St Paul, 236
More (Henry), 102
Moscow (MS.), postscript of, 2, 25
Moses, Ethiopian wife of, 188
Muratorian fragment, 211, 214
Mythology (Egyptian), 15

Newman (John), work on Athanasius, 107, 108, 123
Nicaea (Creed of), 65

Obedience of Christ, 180 et passim
Offering of the Church in Eucharist, 273 et sq.
Ophites, the, 212

Origen
First Principles of, 42
on Divine education, 64
quotes Plato, 82
on the Divine character, 87
on the Creation, 88
on the absolute causality of God, 89
on the perfect knowledge of God, 89
on the difficulties in the Scriptures, 96
on the Trinity, 126
on the ransom-theory, 168 et sq.
on the ultimate salvation of the Devil, 170
on the compensation-theory, 173
on the Ophites, 212
on inspiration, 193
on inspiration of O.T., 205
on the interpretation of O.T., 186
on the Epistle to the Hebrews, 229
on salvation, 308
Oxenham, *Catholic Doctrine of Atonement*, 172, 175

Papias, 5, 25
influence on Irenaeus, 216, 310
Paschal controversy, 11
Patrick, St, influence of Irenaeus on, 77, 348 et seq.
Paul, St
theology of, 130
style of, 194
Epistles of, 221 et sq., 235
repudiated by Montanists, 235
Peter (St), Epistles of, 230 et sq.
Pfaff
fragments of, referred to, 232
fragments of, refuted, 281 et sq.
Pharaoh, 84
Philemon, Epistle to, not quoted by Irenaeus, 229
Philippi, letter to Church of, 9
Philonic, the distinction regarding Logos, 142
Philosophy, Greek, 15
Photius, 40, 42, 46, 229
Pistis Sophia, the, 326, 331
Plato
distinction of *γένεσις* and *οὐσία*, 145
more pious than Marcion, 82
heretics inferior to, 82
Platonists, Cambridge, 34, 102
Pleroma, theory of, 36
Polycarp, 1, 2, 3, 24, 232
letter of, 25
Polycrates of Ephesus, 11
Portare Deum, meaning of, 118, 147
Potentior principalitas, meaning of, 252
Pothinus (of Lugdunum), 3, 5
Irenaeus presbyter of, 7
Praevaricatio, meaning of, 175
Prayers
to the Trinity, 123
directed to "the heavenly altar," 273
for the Lord's Advent, 275
Predestinating, the will of God, 83
Presbyter, Irenaeus' use of term, 255
Presbyters, line of, 251
προβολεύς, ὁ, of the Father (Greg. Naz.), 116
προβολή (*prolatio*), 116, 141 (protest against)
Prolatio, 116, 141
Prophecy, Incarnation fulfilment of, 158
προφορικός, of the Logos, 142
Propitiatio, as used by Tertullian, 160
Psychology, the, of I., 283 et sq.
Pythagorean numbers, 15

Quartodecimans, the, 11

Recapitulation, doctrine of, 29, 50, 172, 179
Reconciliation
aspect of, in Atonement, 178 et sq.
universal, 181
Redemption, 128, 144
Reformation, the, 48
Regeneration
laver of, 265
Baptismal, 28, 266
Regulae fidei. See *Rules of faith*
Renunciation, Baptismal, 265
Revealer, the Son, of the Father, 129, 156
Revelation
one reason for Incarnation, 155
the, of Christ, 148

Ritschl
on the *kenosis*, 143
on the revelation of Christ, 148
Ritschlian views on Incarnation, 134
Romans, Epistle to, 229
Rome, Church of, 8
bishops of, 45, 253
potentior principalitas of, 252
creed of, 66
Ropes, 2
Rule of faith
Irenaeus', c. v
reconstruction of, 65, 340 et sq.
early summaries of, 76
Nicene form of, 76
Gnostic rules, 67

Sabellianism, 142, 157
Sacerdos
use of term, 261
summus, 266
Sacraments of the Church, c. xv
Salvation
Irenaeus' thoughts on, 298 et sq.
comprehensive, 303
universal economy of, 182
Sanctification in the Eucharist, 280
Sanctus, martyr, 5
Sanday, Dr, 41
inspiration-theory of Irenaeus, 194
Satan
Justin on, 29
conquest of, 172
salvation of, 170
Satisfactio, as used by Tertullian, 160
Schismatics, 248
Scriptures
spiritual nature of, 183
difficulties of, 184, 194
interpretation of, 184
reading and punctuation of, 191
authority of, 195
organic union and continuity of, 200
unity of, based on unity of God, 201
vague use of term, 226
Serapion, of Antioch, 215
Severus, persecutor, 17
Sha'al (Hebrew), meaning of, 189
Shakspeare, 86
Simon, father of heretics, 38
Sin
kept in background, 161
reality of, 163
condemnation and conquest of, 163 et sq.
death of, 173
σκηνοβατοῦν, meaning of, 117
Smyrna, letter to Church of, 8
Socrates and Christ, 27
Son of God, 107 et sq.
Spirit, the Holy
educational work of, 58
Divine Person of Trinity, 108 et sq.
the Giver of life (ζωοποιοῦν), 110
Basil's work on, 111
how related to the Son, 115
the earnest of incorruption, 119
His work of regeneration, 119
Harnack on Personality of, in Irenaeus, 121 et sq.
Personality of, 125
the communication of Christ, 243
invocation of, in Eucharist, 271
to whom given, 287
in the salvation of man, 301 et sq.
Suadela, the, 171
Swedenborg, 37
system of, 335 et sq.
Swete, Professor, *Apocalypse* of, 233
Syriac, 49
theory of Syriac translation, 223

Tatian
as teacher, 30
letter of, to Greeks, 33
heresy of, 45
Tertullian, 7, 16, 35, 66
work against Valentinus, 44
De Praescriptionibus, 49, 168
on the Roman creed, 66
on testimony of soul naturally Christian, 92
on the Logos, 127
legal terms of, 160
on heretic women, 339
on St Paul's inspiration, 195
method with heretics, 198 et sq.
on Marcion, 211
on the continuity of Church, 245
challenge to Gnostics, 251
on Baptism, 266
on the Bread, 'figura corporis,' 277

Testament, the New
compared with Old, 199
from same Author, 202
difference between, 204
key of Old, 205
Canon of, c. XII
authority of, 224
Testament, the Old
inspiration of, 205
contains types of New, 185
subordinated to New, 200
compared with New, 199
purpose of, 204
Theodoret, 10
Theodotion, version of, 45
Theology, 19 et sq.
Theophilus, 142
Theosophy and Gnosticism, 333 et sq.
Timotheus, Epistles to, cited by Irenaeus, 222
Translation, Latin. See Excursus
Transubstantiation, 277
Tribulation, meaning of, 305
Trinity, the Holy, c. VIII
Tulloch quoted, 34
Types, 186

Unity of God, and unity of Scriptures, 201

Valence, associated with Irenaeus, 10
Valentinian Gnosticism, 13 et sq.
Valentinus, 35
threefold principle of interpretation, 193, 238
Veritatis Evangelium, 227
on salvation, 308
Vaughan (Henry), 51, 64
Victor (of Rome), 2, 11, 252
Vienne, Church of, 4
bishops of, 8
Virgin, the, 134, 136 et sq.
obedience of, 147
Our Lord's humanity from, 145
Virgin-birth, the
heresies on, 133
Irenaeus on, 138, 144 et sq.
Vossianus, codex, 17, 47

Warren, F., *Liturgy of Celtic Church*, 3
Wendt, Prof., 59
Werner, *Paulinismus des Irenäus*, 24, 221, 226 et sq.
Westcott (Bishop), essays of, 321
Whately, Archbishop, 199
Whichcote, 18, 34, 51, 64, 97, 107, 296, 311, 345
Will, freedom of, 85
Wisdom, the, of Solomon, 13
Word, the, of God, c. III
pre-existence of, 139
immanence of, 139
generation of, 140 et sq.
Sermo Dei, Ratio Dei, 141
Wordsworth (Bishop)
on the charismatic ministry, 66
on Irenaeus' use of presbyter and bishop, 257
on Dr Hatch's explanation of "bishop," 259
on the prayer for the Lord's Advent, 275
on Transubstantiation, 277

Zahn, 2, 214
Marcellus of Ancyra, 127

PRESS NOTICES

OF WORKS

BY THE SAME AUTHOR

The Atonement and Modern Thought. Cloth Boards, 7/6 net. (Wells, Gardner)

"Dr Hitchcock's work on the Atonement is a book for which the serious reader will be grateful....We can hardly give the book higher praise than to say of it that in its general philosophical attitude, its insistence on the importance of personality, its desire to be absolutely faithful to the truth, its eagerness so to present the Atonement as to make it the adequate response to the deepest needs of man and the highest movements of human thought, it is a not unworthy companion of Moberly's *Atonement and Personality*. We would close with the heartiest commendation of a book which treats so reverently and so worthily its theme."—*Westminster Gazette.*

"A book of most substantial merit, one that is a real contribution to its theme, and one which no student of the Atonement can afford to neglect."—*Daily News.*

"The present work proves that Dr Hitchcock is a scholar and a thinker."—*Aberdeen Free Press.*

"A valuable addition to the literature of its subject."—*Scotsman.*

"A most successful attempt to impart vitality and reality to old theological categories and formulae."—*Dundee Advertiser.*

"The studious and thoughtful reader will be spiritually aided by Dr Hitchcock's book."—*Western Morning News.*

"Those interested in the subject will find his lectures scholarly, suggestive and readable, and that his view deserves the serious attention of theological students and experts."—*Glasgow Herald.*

"A fine and scholarly performance....We heartily congratulate Dr Hitchcock and the University of Dublin before which these lectures were delivered."—*Christian World.*

"An able and thoughtful book on a great subject."—*Irish Times.*

"A valuable work...deserves a high place in the long series of Donnellan Lectures."—*Church of Ireland Gazette.*

"A real contribution to the thought of our age upon this all important subject."—*Record.*

"Lectures which reveal much ability in the analysis of theological doctrine."—*The Times.*

A Fresh Study of the Fourth Gospel. Cloth, 2/6. (S.P.C.K.)

"Dr Hitchcock has written a vivid study of the Gospel defending its genuineness and authenticity. He does not accept Wendt's partition theory. He maintains that the Gospel with its speeches and signs is one organic work. Valuable are his detailed examinations of the dramatic development and the artistic structure of the Gospel and of the development of thought in the public speeches and private discourses. In the last chapter the literary relations of the Gospel to the Petrine writings are fully set forth in proof of the genuineness of the work."—*Theologische Jahresbericht.*

"Dr Hitchcock has given us a notable book....He is an original worker who has digged and delved for himself."—*Church Family Newspaper.*

"Lovers of St John will greatly prize this essay."—*London Quarterly Review.*

"Anyone who reads the Fourth Gospel with this as a handbook and studies it on the lines indicated cannot fail to derive fresh insight and real benefit."—*Church Times.*

"This book should prove especially useful to theological students. It is clear in style, trenchant in criticism."—*The Academy.*

"We would express our sincere gratitude for this extremely interesting and welcome book. No sympathetic reader can rise from the perusal of its vivid and glowing words without having a quickened sense of the majestic onward movement of the 'mystical gospel.'" *Church of Ireland Gazette.*

The Present and the Future Christ. Cloth, 2/6. (S.P.C.K.)

"A spiritual commentary on the Fourth Gospel."—*Athenaeum.*

"We were deeply impressed by the union of accurate scholarship and devout reverence."—*Church of Ireland Gazette.*

"His chapters are excellent."—*Church Times.*

"This is just the book to put into the hands of the younger clergy who have such vital problems to grapple with in these days of unrest and unsettlement: it will enable them in some measure to meet these difficulties with greater confidence and resolution."—*The Churchman.*

"All classes of readers may find in these pregnant pages much that tends to quicken, comfort and uplift."—*Daily Express.*

"The whole exposition is most suggestive."—*Western Morning News.*

"The ideas are most clearly and attractively set out in plain language, and yet the deep and solid learning of the author is felt as a kind of undercurrent....It has a message for the soul; many will thank God for this inspiring and helpful work, for the author has been taught of God and knows how to impart what he has learnt."—*Church Family Newspaper.*

Clement of Alexandria. Cloth, 3/. (S.P.C.K.)

"An excellent account of the surroundings, the writings, the teaching and the life of a truly lovable man. Among many well arranged topics are the account of Alexandria, the Gnostics, Clement's teaching on the Incarnation, the Bible and the Sacraments, with a carefully executed reconstruction of Clement's Creed."—*The Guardian.*

"A succinct account of Alexandria and the spiritual antecedents of Clement...followed by an interesting account of Clement's own work."—*Spectator.*

"A model handbook for English students of the Fathers...brightly written, well set out and full of matter."—*London Quarterly Review.*

"As a compendious account of the man and his works and the times which produced him the book is worthy of all praise."—*The Church Times.*

"An original and very searching study."—*Church of Ireland Gazette.*

"Dr Hitchcock is evidently a clever man and a good scholar. The spirit in which his work is conceived deserves praise."—*Athenaeum.*

St Augustine's "City of God." A translation with notes. New and revised edition. Cloth, 1/6. (S.P.C.K.)

"Indicates the greatest care in the way of an exact translation."—*Pall Mall Gazette.*

"Most efficiently edited...introduction excellent...of great interest and value to students."—*London Quarterly Review.*

"A capital edition of an early Church Classic with a valuable preface."—*Methodist SS. Record.*

"Is skilfully analysed, abridged and annotated."—*Gentleman's Journal.*

Christ and His Critics. Cloth, 3/-. (Robert Scott.)

"Dr Hitchcock writes with a clearness not always associated with a theologian, a simplicity of diction and expression of thought that makes his volume as attractive as it is valuable."—*Irish Times.*

"A well written and well informed book...examines the revelations of science with fine judgment and grasp of detail...this is a strong book and it will do much good."—*Life of Faith.*

"Method critical, equipment adequate, conclusions conservative." *Christian World.*

"Is one of the most erudite writers on theological subjects we have on this side of the Irish Sea."—*Dublin Express.*

"The book is not merely criticism of the critics, it is commendation of the Christ."—*Expository Times.*

"These studies are thoughtful, able and reverent."—*Sword and Trowel.*

"Brings out a really telling argument for the divinity and authority of Christ with force."—*British Congregationalist.*

"The fruit of careful reading and is written with zeal and deep reverence."—*The Churchman.*

"A sane and adequate treatment of the *Kenosis* theories....And in an appendix there is a short and careful analysis of the views set out by Dr Sanday in his recent book....The book is marked throughout by accurate scholarship, with which is combined a true spiritual instinct."—*The Church Gazette.*

"Valuable discussion of modern problems."—*Record.*

The Present Controversy on Prayer. Cloth, 2/o. (S.P.C.K.)

"The book will clear away many doubts and furnish much encouragement to humble and believing minds. It is a sensible and reasonable survey of the whole question."—*London Quarterly Review.*

"An attempt to answer the philosophical, scientific and experimental objections to prayer. Sound arguments and reverent conviction go hand in hand and we feel the writer makes his points."—*The Churchman.*

"Exposes the Christian value of prayer...not only deserves but ought to receive universal study and consideration."—*The Academy.*

"Deals very effectively with the objections urged against prayer."—*English Churchman.*

"Will be welcomed by Christians in general, irrespective of creed."—*Pall Mall Gazette.*

"A somewhat original feature is the collection of extracts from the prayers of heathendom and Judaism...but the most valuable chapters are perhaps those which are devoted to different aspects of the *Pater Noster.*"—*The Guardian.*

"Has already made his reputation as a careful and philosophic writer."—*Church of Ireland Gazette.*

"A valuable addition to our literature in defence of religion against atheism and agnosticism."—*Catholic Book Notes.*

"The division of the subject matter is clear and the work is rich in illustrations."—*Tablet.*

Suggestions for Bible Study. Cloth, 2/-. (Elliot Stock.)

"Especially suitable for that large section of thinking people who desire to know more fully the true basis of our belief in the sufficiency of Scripture. Dr Hitchcock, in addition to extensive reading, has in marked degree a power of thought and expression."—*Church Gazette.*

"Dr Hitchcock goes beyond the language to the thought of the Bible, but the value of his book lies in the fact that he goes through the language."—*Expository Times.*

"We cannot too warmly commend the volume of *Suggestions for Bible Study* just issued by the Rev. F. R. Montgomery Hitchcock, the author of several standard works which are widely read and valued."—*The News.*

"Much learning and more thoughtfulness have gone to the making of this opportune and helpful book.... We are very glad to have read the book and to commend it to our readers."—*The Guardian.*

"Deals sanely and sympathetically with the questions of authority and interpretation, revelation and its problems."—*Life of Faith.*

"The work is one the clergy will be glad to know of as a book that they can suitably recommend to intelligent laymen."—*Dublin Express.*

"Will have great value to those whose minds have been disturbed by recent critical enquiries, and will tend to the settlement of thought."—*London Quarterly Review.*

The Mystery of the Cross. Cloth, 3/6. (Skeffington.)

"A carefully written narrative of the events of Holy Week. .of considerable expository service."—*The Guardian.*

"Scholarly and devotional, practical and critical....Stimulating and suggestive...a valuable help to the clergy in their work of preparation."—*Irish Times.*

"A scholarly and devout examination of all the events of the great week. We feel the writer to be an honour to the Church of Ireland. The book is full of information and of sound teaching conveyed in a beautiful spirit."—*Church in the West.*

"Deeply reverent, both orthodox and critical...alike for personal study and help in teaching this volume will be found a very valuable aid."—*Church Family Newspaper.*

"Much freshness of treatment, with evidence of careful study...a volume which all can read and benefit by."—*National Church.*

"A solid contribution to the cause of sacred literature."—*Church of Ireland Gazette.*

Types of Celtic Life and Art. Cloth, 3/6. (Sealy, Bryers.)

"A consideration of the whole Celtic social system. A book that ought to be in the prize list of all schools."—*Sinn Féin.*

Midland Septs and the Pale. Cloth, 3/6. (Sealy, Bryers.)

"A vivid account of the doings of the original Irish Septs and the later English settlers of the King's Co."—*Scotsman.*

"Lovers of things Celtic will thank Dr Hitchcock for his capable volume."—*Dundee Advertiser.*

"We welcome Dr Hitchcock's reappearance in the domain of Irish history.. There is the instinct of scholarship, there is balance, there is thirst for evidence. It is a careful, conscientious piece of work by a scholarly mind; well written and remarkably free from errors."—"Sean-Gall" in *Sinn Féin.*

Hebrew Types. 6/. *Studies in Hebrew Life and Thought.* (Francis Griffiths.)

"Brings out the psychological unity of the Old Testament....The book is built upon the most reliable literary and archaeological materials. Its notes are plentiful and to the point."—*Expository Times.*

"Having regard to the author's standpoint and intention the work is excellently done."—*The Universe.*

"The book is one of the best from Dr Hitchcock's able and discriminating pen. It is a powerful book."—*The Daily Express.*

"The book is a valuable one to Biblical and theological students."—*Belfast News-Letter.*

"The book is characterized throughout by learning, breadth and wisdom."—*Aberdeen Free Press.*

"These Studies of Hebrew Life and Thought make a valuable addition to the literature of the Old Testament."—*Dundee Advertiser.*

"He takes a broad, sane and scholarly view of the Old Testament."—*Methodist Times.*

"This is a book to place by the side of the older commentaries."—*Baptist Times.*

Cambridge:
PRINTED BY JOHN CLAY, M.A.
AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS

13,882 281.32
H37
Hitchcock, F. R. Montgomery
AUTHOR
Irenaeus of Lugdunum - A Study of
TITLE Hist Teaching.

ST. ALBERT'S COLLEGE LIBRARY